arXiv:1201.1332v1 [math.NT] 6 Jan 2012

Quasi-monomial actions and some 4-dimensional rationality problems

Akinari Hoshi[1], Ming-chang Kang[2] and Hidetaka Kitayama[3]

(1)Department of Mathematics, Rikkyo University, Tokyo, Japan

(2)Department of Mathematics and Taida Institute of Mathematical Sciences, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan

(3)Department of Mathematics, Osaka University, Osaka, Japan

Abstract. Let G be a finite group acting on $k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, the rational function field of n variables over a field k. The action is called a purely monomial action if $\sigma \cdot x_j = \prod_{1 \le i \le n} x_i^{a_{ij}}$ for all $\sigma \in G$, for $1 \le j \le n$ where $(a_{ij})_{1 \le i,j \le n} \in GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$. The main question is that, under what situations, the fixed field $k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^G$ is rational (= purely transcendental) over k. This rationality problem has been studied by Hajja, Kang, Hoshi, Rikuna when $n \le 3$. In this paper we will prove that $k(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)^G$ is rational over k provided that the purely monomial action is decomposable. To prove this result, we introduce a new notion, the quasi-monomial action, which is a generalization of previous notions of multiplicative group actions. Moreover, we determine the rationality problem of purely quasi-monomial actions of $K(x, y)^G$ over k where $k = K^G$.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 12F20, 13A50, 14E08.

Keywords and phrases. Rationality problem, monomial actions, embedding problem, Noether's problem, algebraic tori.

E-mails : hoshi@rikkyo.ac.jp, kang@math.ntu.edu.tw, h-kitayama@cr.math.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp

The first-named author was partially supported by KAKENHI (22740028). The second-named author was partially supported by the National Center for Theoretic Sciences (Taipei Office). Some part of this work was done during the first-named author and the third-named author visited the National Center for Theoretic Sciences (Taipei Office), whose support is gratefully acknowledged.

§1. Introduction

Let k be a field, L be a finitely generated field extension of k. L is called k-rational (or rational over k) if L is purely transcendental over k, i.e. L is isomorphic to $k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, the rational function field of n variables over k for some integer n. L is called k-unirational (or unirational over k) if $k \subset L \subset k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ for some integer n. It is clear that "k-rational"$\Rightarrow$"k-unirational". The classical rationality problem (also known as the Lüroth problem) asks whether a k-unirational field is k-rational. Although the rationality problem has counter-examples in dimension 3 in 1970's, many special cases of it, e.g. Noether's problem for non-abelian groups, are still mysterious and await to be explored. The reader is referred to the papers [MT; CTS; Sw] for surveys of the various rationality problems and Noether's problem.

The rationality problem of twisted multiplicative actions on rational function fields [Sa3, p.538; Sa4, p.535; Ka5, Section 2] is ubiquitous in the investigation of Noether's problem and other rationality problems. In this paper, we introduce a more general twisted multiplicative action, the quasi-monomial action, which arose already in the literature [Sa3, p.542; Ka4, p.2773]. A good understanding of the rationality problem of quasi-monomial actions is useful to solving other rationality problems.

Definition 1.1 Let G be a finite subgroup of $\operatorname{Aut}_k(K(x_1, \ldots, x_n))$ where K/k is a finite field extension and $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is the rational function field of n variables over K. The action of G on $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is called a quasi-monomial action if it satisfies the following three conditions:

(i) $\sigma(K) \subset K$ for any $\sigma \in G$;

(ii) $K^G = k$, where K^G is the fixed field under the action of G; and

(iii) for any $\sigma \in G$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$, $\sigma(x_j) = c_j(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^{n} x_i^{a_{ij}}$ where $c_j(\sigma) \in K^\times$ and $[a_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \in GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$.

The quasi-monomial action is called a purely quasi-monomial action if $c_j(\sigma) = 1$ for any $\sigma \in G$, any $1 \leq j \leq n$ in (iii).

To simplify the wordings in the above situation, we will say that G acts on $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ by purely quasi-monomial k-automorphisms or quasi-monomial k-automorphisms depending on the coefficients $c_j(\sigma) = 1$ or not (thus the assumption $k = K^G$ is understood throughout this paper).

Note that the possibility $k = K$ is not excluded. In fact, when $k = K$, it becomes monomial actions or purely monomial actions which are prototypes of quasi-monomial actions (see Example 1.5).

The main question of this paper is:

Question. Under what situation the fixed field $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^G$ is k-rational if G acts on $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ by quasi-monomial k-automorphisms ?

Example 1.2 When G acts by purely quasi-monomial k-automorphisms and $G \simeq \mathrm{Gal}(K/k)$, i.e. G acts faithfully on K, the fixed field $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^G$ is a function field of some algebraic torus defined over k and split over K [Vo2]. It is easy to see that all the 1-dimensional algebraic tori are rational. The birational classification of the 2-dimensional algebraic tori and the 3-dimensional algebraic tori has been studied by Voskresenskii [Vo1] and Kunyavskii [Ku] respectively. We record their results as the following two theorems.

Theorem 1.3 (Voskresenskii [Vo1]) *Let k be a field. Then all the two-dimensional algebraic k-tori are rational over k. In particular, $K(x_1, x_2)^G$ is always k-rational if G is faithful on K and G acts on $K(x_1, x_2)$ by purely monomial k-automorphisms.*

Theorem 1.4 (Kunyavskii [Ku; Ka5, Section 1]) *Let k be a field. Then all the three-dimensional algebraic k-tori are rational over k except for the* 15 *cases in the list of* [Ku, Theorem 1]. For the exceptional 15 cases, they are not rational over k; in fact, they are even not retract rational over k.

For the definition of retract rationality, see Definition 6.1.

Example 1.5 When G acts trivially on K, i.e. $k = K$, the quasi-monomial action is called the monomial action. When $k = K$ and the quasi-monomial action is purely, it is called a purely monomial action. Monomial actions and purely monomial actions on $k(x_1, x_2)$ and $k(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ were studied by Hajja, Kang, Hoshi, Rikuna, Prokhorov, Yamasaki, Kitayama, etc.. But almost nothing is known about the rationality of $k(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)^G$ where G acts by purely monomial k-automorphisms, to say nothing for the monomial k-actions. In the following we list the known results for the monomial actions and purely monomial actions on $k(x_1, x_2)$ and $k(x_1, x_2, x_3)$.

Theorem 1.6 (Hajja [Ha]) *Let k be a field, G be a finite group acting on $k(x_1, x_2)$ by monomial k-automorphisms. Then $k(x_1, x_2)^G$ is rational over k.*

Theorem 1.7 (Hajja, Kang, Hoshi, Rikuna [HK1; HK2; HR]) *Let k be a field, G be a finite group acting on $k(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ by purely monomial k-automorphisms. Then $k(x_1, x_2, x_3)^G$ is rational over k.*

Theorem 1.8 (Yamasaki, Hoshi, Kitayama, Prokhorov [Ya; HKY; Pr]) *Let k be a field of* char $k \neq 2$, *G be a finite group acting on $k(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ by monomial k-automorphisms such that $\rho_{\underline{x}} : G \to GL_3(\mathbb{Z})$ is injective* (where $\rho_{\underline{x}}$ is the group homomorphism in Definition 1.11). Then $k(x_1, x_2, x_3)^G$ is rational over k except for the 8 cases contained in [Ya] and one additional case. For the last exceptional case, the fixed field $k(x_1, x_2, x_3)^G$ is also rational over k except for a minor situation. In particular, if k is an algebraically closed field with char $k \neq 2$, then $k(x_1, x_2, x_3)^G$ is rational over k for any action of G on $k(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ by monomial k-automorphisms.

Theorem 1.9 (Kang, Michailov, Zhou [KMZ, Theorem 2.5]) *Let k be a field with* char $k \neq 2$, *α be a non-zero element in k. Let G be a finite group acting on $k(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ by monomial k-automorphisms with all the coefficients $c_j(\sigma)$* (in Definition 1.1) belonging to $\langle \alpha \rangle$. Assume that $\sqrt{-1}$ is in k. Then $k(x_1, x_2, x_3)^G$ is rational over k.

Example 1.10 Assume that $G \simeq \mathrm{Gal}(K/k)$, i.e. G acts faithfully on K. Suppose that $a_\sigma \in GL_{n+1}(K)$ for each $\sigma \in G$. Denote by $\bar{a}_\sigma$ the image of a_σ in the canonical map $GL_{n+1}(K) \to PGL_{n+1}(K)$. Consider the rational function fields $K(y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ and $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ where $x_i = y_i/y_0$ for $1 \le i \le n$. For each $\sigma \in G$, a_σ induces a k-automorphism on $K(y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ and $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ (note that elements of K in $K(y_0, \ldots, y_n)$ are acted through $\mathrm{Gal}(K/k)$). Assume furthermore that the map $\gamma : G \to PGL_n(K)$ defined by $\gamma(\sigma) = \bar{a}_\sigma$ is a 1-cocycle, i.e. $\gamma \in H^1(G, PGL_n(K))$. Then G induces an action on $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. The fixed field $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^G$ is called a Brauer-field $F_{n,k}(\gamma)$, i.e. the function field of an n-dimensional Severi-Brauer variety over k associated to γ [Ro1; Ro2; Ka1]. It is known that a Brauer-field over k is k-rational if and only if it is k-unirational [Se, page 160]. If we assume that each a_σ is an M-matrix, i.e. each column of a_σ has precisely one non-zero entry, then the action of G on $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ becomes a quasi-monomial action.

From Example 1.10, we find that, for a quasi-monomial action of G, the fixed field $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^G$ is not always k-unirational. However, for the quasi-monomial actions discussed in Example 1.2 and Example 1.5, $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^G$ are always k-unirational (see [Vo2, page 40, Example 21]).

Before stating the first main result of this paper, we define another terminology related to a quasi-monomial action.

Definition 1.11 Let G act on $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ by quasi-monomial k-automorphisms with the conditions (i), (ii), (iii) in Definition 1.1. Define a group homomorphism $\rho_{\underline{x}} : G \to GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ by $\Phi_{\underline{x}}(\sigma) = [a_{i,j}]_{1 \le i,j \le n} \in GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ for any $\sigma \in G$ where the matrix $[a_{i,j}]_{1 \le i,j \le n}$ is given by $\sigma(x_j) = c_j(\sigma) \prod_{1 \le i \le n} x_i^{a_{ij}}$ in (iii) of Definition 1.1.

Proposition 1.12 *Let G be a finite group acting on $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ by quasi-monomial k-automorphisms. Then there is a normal subgroup N of G satisfying the following conditions :* (i) $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^N = K^N(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ where each y_i is of the form $a x_1^{e_1} x_2^{e_2} \cdots x_n^{e_n}$ with $a \in K^\times$ and $e_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ (we may take $a = 1$ if the action is a purely quasi-monomial action), (ii) G/N acts on $K^N(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ by quasi-monomial k-automorphisms, and (iii) $\rho_{\underline{y}} : G/N \to GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ is an injective group homomorphism.

Here is an easy application of Proposition 1.12.

Proposition 1.13 (1) *Let G be a finite group acting on $K(x)$ by purely quasi-monomial k-automorphisms. Then $K(x)^G$ is k-rational.*

(2) *Let G be a finite group acting on $K(x)$ by quasi-monomial k-automorphisms. Then $K(x)^G$ is k-rational except for the following case :* There is a normal subgroup N of G such that (i) $G/N = \langle \sigma \rangle \simeq C_2$, (ii) $K(x)^N = k(\alpha)(y)$ with $\alpha^2 = a \in K^\times$, $\sigma(\alpha) = -\alpha$ (if $\mathrm{char}\, k \ne 2$), and $\alpha^2 + \alpha = a \in K$, $\sigma(\alpha) = \alpha + 1$ (if $\mathrm{char}\, k = 2$), (iii) $\sigma \cdot y = b/y$ for some $b \in k^\times$.

For the exceptional case, $K(x)^G = k(\alpha)(y)^{G/N}$ is k-rational if and only if the norm residue 2-symbol $(a, b)_k = 0$ (if $\mathrm{char}\, k \ne 2$), and $[a, b)_k = 0$ (if $\mathrm{char}\, k = 2$).

Moreover, if $K(x)^G$ is not k-rational, then k is an infinite field, the Brauer group $\mathrm{Br}(k)$ is non-trivial, and $K(x)^G$ is not k-unirational.

For the definition of the norm residue 2-symbols $(a,b)_k$ and $[a,b)_k$, see [Dr, Chapter 11].

The first main result of this paper is the following.

Theorem 1.14 *Let G be a finite group acting on $K(x,y)$ by purely quasi-monomial k-automorphisms. Define $N=\{\sigma\in G:\sigma(x)=x,\ \sigma(y)=y\}$, $H=\{\sigma\in G:\sigma(\alpha)=\alpha$ for all $\alpha\in K\}$. Then $K(x,y)^G$ is rational over k except possibly for the following situation :* (1) $\operatorname{char} k\neq 2$ and (2) $(G/N,HN/N)\simeq(C_4,C_2)$ or (D_4,C_2).

More precisely, in the exceptional situation we may choose $u,v\in k(x,y)$ satisfying that $k(x,y)=k(u,v)$ (and therefore $K(x,y)=K(u,v)$) such that

- (i) when $(G/N,HN/N)\simeq(C_4,C_2)$, $K^N=k(\sqrt{a})$ for some $a\in k\backslash k^2$, $G/N=\langle\sigma\rangle\simeq C_4$, then σ acts on $K^N(u,v)$ by $\sigma:\sqrt{a}\mapsto-\sqrt{a}$, $u\mapsto\frac{1}{u}$, $v\mapsto-\frac{1}{v}$; or
- (ii) when $(G/N,HN/N)\simeq(D_4,C_2)$, $K^N=k(\sqrt{a},\sqrt{b})$ is a biquadratic extension of k with $a,b\in k\backslash k^2$, $G/N=\langle\sigma,\tau\rangle\simeq D_4$, then σ and τ act on $K^N(u,v)$ by $\sigma:\sqrt{a}\mapsto-\sqrt{a}$, $\sqrt{b}\mapsto\sqrt{b}$, $u\mapsto\frac{1}{u}$, $v\mapsto-\frac{1}{v}$, $\tau:\sqrt{a}\mapsto\sqrt{a}$, $\sqrt{b}\mapsto-\sqrt{b}$, $u\mapsto u$, $v\mapsto-v$.

For Case (i), $K(x,y)^G$ is k-rational if and only if the norm residue 2-symbol $(a,-1)_k=0$. For Case (ii), $K(x,y)^G$ is k-rational if and only if $(a,-b)_k=0$.

Moreover, if $K(x,y)^G$ is not k-rational, then k is an infinite field, the Brauer group $\operatorname{Br}(k)$ is non-trivial, and $K(x,y)^G$ is not k-unirational.

The following definition gives an equivalent definition of quasi-monomial actions, which will be used in our second main result. This definition follows the approach of Saltman's definition of twisted multiplicative actions [Sa3; Sa4; Ka5, Definition 2.2].

Definition 1.15 Let G be a finite group. A G-lattice M is a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-module which is $\mathbb{Z}$-free as an abelian group, i.e. $M=\bigoplus_{1\leq i\leq n}\mathbb{Z}\cdot x_i$ with a $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-module structure. Let K/k be a field extension such that G acts on K with $K^G=k$. Consider a short exact sequence of $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-modules $\alpha:1\to K^\times\to M_\alpha\to M\to 0$ where M is a G-lattice and $K^\times$ is regarded as a $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-module through the G-action on K. The $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-module structure (written multiplicatively) of M_α may be described as follows : For each $x_j\in M$ (where $1\leq j\leq n$), take a pre-image u_j of x_j. As an abelian group, M_α is the direct product of $K^\times$ and $\langle u_1,\ldots,u_n\rangle$. If $\sigma\in G$ and $\sigma\cdot x_j=\sum_{1\leq i\leq n}a_{ij}x_i\in M$, we find that $\sigma\cdot u_j=c_j(\sigma)\cdot\prod_{1\leq i\leq n}u_i^{a_{ij}}\in M_\alpha$ for a unique $c_j(\sigma)\in K^\times$ determined by the group extension α.

Using the same idea, once a group extension $\alpha:1\to K^\times\to M_\alpha\to M\to 0$ is given, we may define a quasi-monomial action of G on the rational function field $K(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ as follows : If $\sigma\cdot x_j=\sum_{1\leq i\leq n}a_{ij}x_i\in M$, then define $\sigma\cdot x_j=c_j(\sigma)\prod_{1\leq i\leq n}x_i^{a_{ij}}\in K(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ and $\sigma\cdot\alpha=\sigma(\alpha)$ for $\alpha\in K$ where $\sigma(\alpha)$ is the image of α under σ via the prescribed action of G on K. This quasi-monomial action is well-defined (see [Sa3, p.538] for details). The field $K(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ with such a G-action will be denoted by

$K_\alpha(M)$ to emphasize the role of the extension α; its fixed field is denoted as $K_\alpha(M)^G$. We will say that G acts on $K_\alpha(M)$ by quasi-monomial k-automorphisms.

If $k = K$, then $k_\alpha(M)^G$ is nothing but the fixed field associated to the monomial action discussed in Example 1.5.

If the extension α splits, then we may take $u_1, \ldots, u_n \in M_\alpha$ satisfying that $\sigma \cdot u_j = \prod_{1\leq i\leq n} u_i^{a_{ij}}$. Hence the associated quasi-monomial action of G on $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ becomes a purely quasi-monomial action. In this case, we will write $K_\alpha(M)$ and $K_\alpha(M)^G$ as $K(M)$ and $K(M)^G$ respectively (the subscript α is omitted because the extension α plays no important role). We will say that G acts on $K(M)$ by purely quasi-monomial k-automorphisms. Again $k(M)^G$ is the fixed field associated to the purely monomial action discussed in Example 1.5.

Now we arrive at the second main result of this paper. As mentioned in Example 1.5, the rationality problem of $k(M)^G$ where M is a G-lattice of $\mathbb{Z}$-rank 4 is still unsolved. With the aid of Theorem 1.14, we are able to show that $k(M)^G$ is k-rational whenever M is a decomposable G-lattice of $\mathbb{Z}$-rank 4. From the list of [BBNWZ], there are 710 finite subgroups in $GL_4(\mathbb{Z})$ up to conjugation (i.e. there are 710 lattices of $\mathbb{Z}$-rank 4); the total number of decomposable ones is 415. Here is the precise statement of our result.

Theorem 1.16 *Let k be a field, G be a finite group, M be a G-lattice with* $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M = 4$ *such that G acts on $k(M)$ by purely monomial k-automorphisms. If M is decomposable, i.e. $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$ as $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-modules where* $1 \leq \operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M_1 \leq 3$*, then $k(M)^G$ is k-rational.*

We remark that the analogous question of the above theorem for the case of algebraic tori (i.e. $G \simeq Gal(K/k)$ and M is a decomposable G-lattice) is not so challenging, because the rationality of $K(M)^G$ can be reduced to those of $K(M_1)^G$ and $K(M_2)^G$ (see Theorem 6.5). On the other hand, we may adapt the proof of Theorem 1.14 to study the rationality of $k(M)^G$ when $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M = 5$ and M is some special decomposable G-lattice. See Theorem 6.2.

We organize this paper as follows. The proof of Propositions 1.12 and 1.13 is given in Section 2. Section 3 contains a list of all finite subgroups of $GL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ and three rationality results which will be used in Section 4. Lemma 3.4 is of interests itself. The proof of Theorem 1.14 is given in Section 4. Section 5 contains the proof of Theorem 1.16. Section 6 is devoted to a 5-dimensional rationality problem.

Standing notations. Throughout this paper, G is always a finite group. $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ denotes the rational function field of n variables over a field K; when $n = 1$, we will write $K(x)$; when $n = 2$, we will write $K(x, y)$. For a field K, $K^\times$ denote the set of all non-zero elements of K. As notations of groups, C_n is the cyclic group of order n, D_n is the dihedral group of order $2n$, S_n is the symmetric group of degree n, V_4 is the Klein four group, i.e. $V_4 \simeq C_2 \times C_2$.

Recall the definition of (purely) quasi-monomial actions in Definition 1.1 and Definition 1.15. In particular, whenever we say that G acts on $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ (or $K_\alpha(M)$) by quasi-monomial k-automorphisms, it is understood that the group G and the field extension K/k together with the G-action on K satisfy the assumptions in Definitions 1.1 and 1.15. The definition of (purely) monomial actions is recalled in Example 1.5 and Definition 1.15. The reader should also keep in mind the group homomorphism $\rho_{\underline{x}} : G \to GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ in Definition 1.11.

§2. Proof of Proposition 1.12 and Proposition 1.13

Proof of Proposition 1.12.

Let G act on $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ by quasi-monomial k-automorphisms.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $G \subset \mathrm{Aut}_k(K(x_1, \ldots, x_n))$. In particular, G acts faithfully on $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. Consider the group homomorphism $\rho_{\underline{x}} : G \to GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ in Definition 1.11.

Step 1. Define $N = \mathrm{Ker}(\rho_{\underline{x}}) = \{\sigma \in G : \frac{\sigma \cdot x_j}{x_j} \in K^\times \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq n\}$.

Define $N_0 = \{\sigma \in N : \sigma(\alpha) = \alpha \text{ for any } \alpha \in K\}$.

If the action is a monomial action, then $k = K$ and $N_0 = N$.

Clearly $N \triangleleft G$. We will show that $N_0 \triangleleft G$.

If $\sigma \in N_0$, we may write $\sigma \cdot x_j = \alpha_j x_j$ for some $\alpha_j \in K^\times$. For any $\tau \in G$, if $\tau \cdot x_j = c_j(\tau) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i^{a_{ij}}$ for some $c_j(\tau) \in K^\times$ and $[a_{ij}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \in GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$, define $\sigma' \in N_0$ by $\sigma' \cdot \alpha = \alpha$ for all $\alpha \in K$ and $\sigma' \cdot x_j = \beta_j x_j$ with $\beta_j = \tau^{-1}(c_j(\tau)^{-1}) \cdot \tau^{-1}\sigma(c_j(\tau)) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \tau^{-1}(\alpha_i)^{a_{ij}}$. It is routine to verify $\tau^{-1}\sigma\tau = \sigma'$. Hence $N_0 \triangleleft G$ also.

Step 2. We will determine $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^{N_0}$.

For any $\sigma \in N_0$, write $\sigma \cdot x_j = c_j(\sigma) x_j$ with $c_j(\sigma) \in K^\times$. Since N_0 is a finite group, all the $c_j(\sigma)$ (where $\sigma \in N_0$, $1 \leq j \leq n$) are roots of unity. Hence they generate a cyclic group $\langle \zeta \rangle$ where ζ is some root of unity.

Choose generators $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_m$ of N_0, i.e. $N_0 = \langle \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_m \rangle$. Define a group homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : \{x_1^{\lambda_1} x_2^{\lambda_2} \cdots x_n^{\lambda_n} : \lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}\} &\to \langle \zeta \rangle^m \\ X = x_1^{\lambda_1} x_2^{\lambda_2} \cdots x_n^{\lambda_n} &\mapsto \left(\frac{\sigma_1(X)}{X}, \frac{\sigma_2(X)}{X}, \ldots, \frac{\sigma_m(X)}{X} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Define $M = \mathrm{Ker}(\Phi)$. Since $\{x_1^{\lambda_1} \cdots x_n^{\lambda_n} : \lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}\} \simeq \mathbb{Z}^n$, it follows $\mathrm{Ker}(\Phi) \simeq \mathbb{Z}^n$. Thus $M = \{y_1^{\nu_1} y_2^{\nu_2} \cdots y_n^{\nu_n} : \nu_i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ where each y_i is of the form $x_1^{e_1} x_2^{e_2} \cdots x_n^{e_n}$ for some $e_j \in \mathbb{Z}$.

It is not difficult to see that $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^{N_0} = K(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$.

Moreover, G/N_0 acts on $K(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ by quasi-monomial k-automorphisms. For any $\tau \in G$, we will show that $\tau \cdot y_i = \beta \cdot y_1^{\nu_1} y_2^{\nu_2} \cdots y_n^{\nu_n}$ for some $\beta \in K^\times$, some $\nu_i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Since we may write $y_j = x_1^{e_1} x_2^{e_2} \cdots x_n^{e_n}$, it follows that $\tau \cdot y_j = \beta' \cdot x_1^{e'_1} x_2^{e'_2} \cdots x_n^{e'_n}$ for some $\beta' \in K^\times$, some $e'_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. It remains to show that $x_1^{e'_1} x_2^{e'_2} \cdots x_n^{e'_n} = y_1^{\mu_1} y_2^{\mu_2} \cdots y_n^{\mu_n}$ for some $\mu_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, i.e. $x_1^{e'_1} x_2^{e'_2} \cdots x_n^{e'_n} \in \mathrm{Ker}(\Phi) = \langle\, y_1, \ldots, y_n\rangle$, which is equivalent to showing $\sigma(x_1^{e'_1} x_2^{e'_2} \cdots x_n^{e'_n}) = x_1^{e'_1} \cdots x_n^{e'_n}$ for all $\sigma \in N_0$.

From $\tau \cdot y_j = \beta' x_1^{e'_1} \cdots x_n^{e'_n}$, if $\sigma \in N_0$, we get $\sigma\tau(y_j) = \sigma(\beta')\sigma(x_1^{e'_1} \cdots x_n^{e'_n}) = \beta'\sigma(x_1^{e'_1} \cdots x_n^{e'_n})$ because $\sigma(\beta') = \beta'$. On the other hand, $\sigma\tau(y_j) = \tau(\tau^{-1}\sigma\tau)(y_j) = \tau(\tau^{-1}\sigma\tau(y_j)) = \tau \cdot y_j$ because $\tau^{-1}\sigma\tau \in N_0$. We get $\sigma(x_1^{e'_1} \cdots x_n^{e'_n}) = x_1^{e'_1} \cdots x_n^{e'_n}$ for any $\sigma \in N_0$. Done.

Step 3. We will determine the field $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^N = \{K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^{N_0}\}^{N/N_0} = K(y_1, \ldots, y_n)^{N/N_0}$. If $N_0 = N$, nothing is to be proved and we may proceed to Step 4. On the other hand, if the action of G is purely quasi-monomial, then $\sigma \cdot x_j = x_j$ for any $\sigma \in N$ from the definition of the subgroup N. Thus $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^N = K^N(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. This confirms that each y_i is of the form $x_1^{e_1} x_2^{e_2} \cdots x_n^{e_n}$ in (i) of the statement of this proposition.

For the remaining part of this step, we assume that $N_0 \neq N$.

For any $\sigma \in N$, since $\frac{\sigma \cdot x_j}{x_j} \in K^\times$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$, it follows that $\frac{\sigma \cdot y_i}{y_i} \in K^\times$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Write $\sigma \cdot y_i = c_i(\sigma) y_i$ for $c_i(\sigma) \in K^\times$, $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Note that $c_i \in H^1(N/N_0, K^\times)$, i.e. for any $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in N/N_0$, $c_i(\sigma_1\sigma_2) = \sigma_1(c_i(\sigma_2)) \cdot c_i(\sigma_1)$. Since N/N_0 is faithful on K, it follows that $H^1(N/N_0, K^\times) = 0$ and therefore there is some element $a_i \in K^\times$ such that $c_i(\sigma) = \frac{a_i}{\sigma(a_i)}$ for all $\sigma \in N/N_0$.

Define $z_i = a_i y_i$. It follows that $K(y_1, \ldots, y_n) = K(z_1, \ldots, z_n)$ and $\sigma \cdot z_i = z_i$ for all $\sigma \in N/N_0$, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Hence $K(y_1, \ldots, y_n)^{N/N_0} = K^{N/N_0}(z_1, \ldots, z_n) = K^N(z_1, \ldots, z_n)$.

In summary, if $N \neq \{1\}$, we have reduced the group from G to G/N and G/N acts on $K^N(z_1, \ldots, z_n)$ by quasi-monomial k-automorphisms.

Step 4. Consider $\rho_{\underline{z}} : G/N \to GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$. If $\mathrm{Ker}(\rho_{\underline{z}})$ is non-trivial, we continue the above process and reduce the group from G/N to G/N_1 where $N \subsetneq N_1$. Hence the result. ☐

Proof of Proposition 1.13.

(1) Suppose that G acts on $K(x)$ by purely quasi-monomial k-automorphisms.

For any $\sigma \in G$, $\sigma \cdot x = x$ or $\frac{1}{x}$.

If $\sigma \cdot x = x$ for all $\sigma \in G$, then $K(x)^G = K^G(x) = k(x)$ is k-rational.

From now on, we consider the case that $\sigma \cdot x = \frac{1}{x}$ for some $\sigma \in G$.

Define $N = \{\tau \in G : \tau \cdot x = x\}$. Then $G = N \cup \sigma N$.

It follows that $K(x)^N = K^N(x)$ and $[K^N : k] \leq 2$. If $K^N = k$, then $K(x)^G = \{K(x)^N\}^{\langle\sigma\rangle} = \{K^N(x)\}^{\langle\sigma\rangle} = k(x)^{\langle\sigma\rangle} = k(x + \frac{1}{x})$ is k-rational.

It remains to consider the case $K^N = k(\alpha)$ is a quadratic separable extension.

Case 1. $\mathrm{char}\, k \neq 2$, we may assume that $\alpha = \sqrt{a}$ for some $a \in k^\times$. Hence $\sigma \cdot \alpha = -\alpha$. Define $y = \frac{1-x}{1+x}$. Then $\sigma \cdot y = -y$. It follows that $k(\alpha)(x)^{\langle\sigma\rangle} = k(\alpha)(y)^{\langle\sigma\rangle} = k(\alpha)(\alpha y)^{\langle\sigma\rangle} = k(\alpha y)$ is k-rational.

Case 2. $\operatorname{char} k = 2$, we may assume that $\alpha^2+\alpha = b \in k$. Hence $\sigma\cdot\alpha = \alpha+1$. Define $y = \frac{1}{1+x}$. Then $\sigma \cdot y = y+1$. It follows that $k(\alpha)(x)^{\langle\sigma\rangle} = k(\alpha)(y)^{\langle\sigma\rangle} = k(\alpha)^{\langle\sigma\rangle}(y+\alpha) = k(y+\alpha)$ is k-rational.

(2) Suppose that G acts on $K(x)$ by quasi-monomial k-automorphisms.

Apply Proposition 1.12. Find a normal subgroup N of G such that (i) $K(x)^N = K^N(y)$ where $y = ax^m$ for some $a \in K^\times$ and some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, (ii) $\rho_{\underline{y}} : G/N \to GL_1(\mathbb{Z}) = \{\pm 1\}$ is injective, and (iii) G/N acts on $K^N(y)$ by quasi-monomial k-automorphisms.

The only non-trivial case is the situation $G/N = \langle\sigma\rangle \simeq C_2$ and σ acts non-trivially on K^N. In this case, we may write $K^N = k(\alpha)$ and $\sigma \cdot y = \frac{b}{y}$ for some $b \in k(\alpha)^\times$.

Since $\sigma^2 = 1$ and $\sigma \cdot y = \frac{b}{y}$, it follows that $b \in k^\times$.

Consider the 1-cocycle $\beta \in H^1(G/N, PGL_2(k(\alpha)))$ defined by

$$\beta(1) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},\ \beta(\sigma) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in PGL_2(k(\alpha)).$$

The Brauer-field $F_{1,k}(\beta)$ defined in Example 1.10 is nothing but $k(\alpha)(y)^{\langle\sigma\rangle}$.

Note that $F_{1,k}(\beta)$ is k-rational if and only if the cyclic algebra $A(\beta)$ associated to β is isomorphic to the matrix algebra $M_2(k)$ [Se, page 160].

Let γ be the image of β in $H^1(G/N, PGL_2(k(\alpha))) \to H^2(G/N, k(\alpha)^\times)$. It is not difficult to verify that γ is the normalized 2-cocycle with $\gamma(\sigma,\sigma) = b$. It follows that the cyclic algebra $A(\beta)$ can be defined as

$$A(\beta) = k(\alpha) \oplus k(\alpha) \cdot u$$

with the relations $u^2 = b$ and $u \cdot t = \sigma(t) \cdot u$ for any $t \in k(\alpha)$.

When $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$, we may choose α such that $\alpha = \sqrt{a}$ for some $a \in k^\times$. Hence $\sigma(\alpha) = -\alpha$ and $A(\beta)$ is just the quaternion algebra $[a,b]_k$.

When $\operatorname{char} k = 2$, we may choose α such that $\alpha^2+\alpha = a \in k$. Hence $\sigma(\alpha) = \alpha+1$ and $A(\beta)$ is the quaternion algebra $[a,b)_k$.

It follows that $A(\beta) \simeq M_2(k)$ if and only if the associated norm residue 2-symbol $(a,b)_k = 0$ (if $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$), and $[a,b)_k = 0$ (if $\operatorname{char} k = 2$).

Finally suppose that the Brauer-field $k(\alpha)(y)^{\langle\sigma\rangle}$ is not k-rational. By the above proof, some norm residue 2-symbol is not zero. Let A be the quaternion k-algebra corresponding to this norm residue symbol. It follows that the similarity class of A in $Br(k)$ is not zero where $Br(k)$ is the Brauer group of the field k. Hence k is an infinite field because $Br(k') = 0$ for any finite field k' by Wedderburn's Theorem [Dr, page 73].

For the other assertion, since the Brauer-field $k(\alpha)(y)^{\langle\sigma\rangle}$ is not k-rational, it is not k-unirational by [Se, page 160] (also see Example 1.10). □

§3. Finite subgroups of $GL_2(\mathbb{Z})$

By [BBNWZ; GAP], there are exactly 13 finite subgroups contained in $GL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ up to conjugation. We list these groups as follows.

Theorem 3.1 *Type A. Cyclic groups*

$$C_1 := \{I\}, \qquad C_2^{(1)} := \langle -I\rangle, \qquad C_2^{(2)} := \langle \lambda\rangle, \qquad C_2^{(3)} := \langle \tau\rangle,$$
$$C_3 := \langle \sigma^2\rangle, \qquad C_4 := \langle \sigma\rangle, \qquad C_6 := \langle \rho\rangle,$$

where

$$I = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \lambda = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tau = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \rho = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Type B. Non-cyclic groups :

$$V_4^{(1)} := \langle \lambda, -I\rangle, \qquad V_4^{(2)} := \langle \tau, -I\rangle, \qquad S_3^{(1)} := \langle \rho^2, \tau\rangle, \qquad S_3^{(2)} := \langle \rho^2, -\tau\rangle,$$
$$D_4 := \langle \sigma, \tau\rangle, \qquad D_6 := \langle \rho, \tau\rangle.$$

Note that $\lambda^2 = \tau^2 = I$, $\sigma^2 = \rho^3 = -I$, and $\tau\sigma = \lambda$.

Lemma 3.2 ([HK2, Lemma 2.7]) *Let k be a field and $-I \in GL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ act on $k(x,y)$ by a k-automorphism defined as*

$$-I : x \mapsto \tfrac{a}{x}, \ y \mapsto \tfrac{b}{y}, \ a, b \in k^{\times}.$$

Then $k(x,y)^{\langle -I\rangle} = k(u,v)$ where

$$u = \frac{x - \frac{a}{x}}{xy - \frac{ab}{xy}}, \quad v = \frac{y - \frac{b}{y}}{xy - \frac{ab}{xy}}.$$

Lemma 3.3 *Let k be a field and $-I \in GL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ act on $k(x,y)$ by a k-automorphism defined as*

$$-I : x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x}, \ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y}.$$

Then $k(x,y)^{\langle -I\rangle} = k(s,t)$ where

$$s = \frac{xy+1}{x+y}, \quad t = \begin{cases} \frac{xy-1}{x-y} & \textit{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 2, \\ \frac{x(y^2+1)}{y(x^2+1)} & \textit{if } \operatorname{char} k = 2. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. When $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$, see [HHR, page 1176; HKY, Lemma 3.4]. When $\operatorname{char} k = 2$, s, t, x and y satisfy the relations

$$y^2 + \frac{(s^2+1)(t+1)}{s} y + 1 = 0, \quad x = \frac{sy+1}{s+y}.$$

Hence the result. □

Lemma 3.4 *Let k be a field and $D_6 = \langle \rho, \tau \rangle$ act on $k(x,y)$ by purely monomial k-automorphisms defined as*

$$\rho : x \mapsto xy,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x}, \quad \tau : x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto x.$$

Then $k(x,y)^{\langle \rho^2 \rangle} = k(S,T)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{x^2y + xy^2 - 3xy + 1}{x^2y^2 - 3xy + x + y}, \\ T &= \begin{cases} \frac{(xy+y+1)(x^2y^2-x^2y+x^2-xy-x+1)}{(xy+x+1)(x^2y^2-3xy+x+y)} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 3, \\ \frac{x(x^3y^3+y^3+1)}{y(x^3y^3+x^3+1)} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 3. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Moreover, $D_6/\langle \rho^2 \rangle = \langle \rho, \tau \rangle$ acts on $k(S,T)$ by

$$\rho : S \mapsto \tfrac{1}{S},\ T \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{S+\frac{1}{S}-1}{T}, \\ \frac{1}{T}, \end{cases} \qquad \tau : S \mapsto S,\ T \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{S(S+\frac{1}{S}-1)}{T} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 3, \\ \frac{1}{T} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 3. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Case 1. $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2, 3$.

Define $z := 1/xy$. The k-automorphism ρ^2 acts on $k(x,y) = k(x,y,z)$ by $\rho^2 : x \mapsto y \mapsto z \mapsto x$ and the fixed field under the action of ρ^2 is given by

$$k(x,y,z)^{\langle \rho^2 \rangle} = k(A,B,C,D) = k(A,B,D) \tag{3.3}$$

where

$$A = x + y + z = \frac{x^2y + xy^2 + 1}{xy}, \quad B = xy + yz + zx = \frac{x^2y^2 + x + y}{xy},$$
$$C = xyz = 1, \quad D = (x-y)(y-z)(x-z) = \frac{(x-y)(xy^2-1)(x^2y-1)}{x^2y^2}.$$

Define $A_0 = A/3$, $B_0 = B/3$, $D_0 = D/9$. Then the generators A_0, B_0 and D_0 of $k(x,y,z)^{\langle \rho^2 \rangle} = k(A_0, B_0, D_0)$ satisfy the relation

$$3D_0^2 = -4A_0^3 + 3A_0^2B_0^2 + 6A_0B_0 - 4B_0^3 - 1. \tag{3.4}$$

Find the singularities of (3.4). We get $A_0 - 1 = B_0 - 1 = D_0 = 0$. Put $A_1 = A_0 - 1$, $B_1 = B_0 - 1$. Then the equation (3.4) becomes

$$3D_0^2 = -4A_1^3 + 3A_1^2B_1^2 + 6A_1^2B_1 - 9A_1^2 + 6A_1B_1^2 + 18A_1B_1 - 4B_1^3 - 9B_1^2$$

with a singular point at the origin $P = (D_0 = A_1 = B_1 = 0)$. Blowing up at the point P by defining $A_2 = A_1/B_1$, $D_1 = D_0/B_1$, we have

$$3D_1^2 = -4A_2^3B_1 + 3A_2^2B_1^2 + 6A_2^2B_1 - 9A_2^2 + 6A_2B_1 + 18A_2 - 4B_1 - 9. \tag{3.5}$$

This equation (3.5) also has singularities $A_2 - B_1 - 2 = B_1^2 + 3B_1 + 3 = D_1 = 0$. Blowing up by defining $A_3 = \frac{A_2 - B_1 - 2}{B_1^2 + 3B_1 + 3}$, $D_2 = \frac{D_1}{B_1^2 + 3B_1 + 3}$, we get

$$(3.6)\ \ 3D_2^2 = -4A_3^3B_1^3 - 12A_3^3B_1^2 - 12A_3^3B_1 - 9A_3^2B_1^2 - 18A_3^2B_1 - 9A_3^2 - 6A_3B_1 - 6A_3 - 1.$$

Define $B_2 = B_1A_3$. Then we get $k(A_3, B_1, D_2) = k(A_3, B_2, D_2)$ with the relation

$$(3.7) \quad 3D_2^2 = -12A_3^2B_2 - 9A_3^2 - 12A_3B_2^2 - 18A_3B_2 - 6A_3 - 4B_2^3 - 9B_2^2 - 6B_2 - 1.$$

The equation (3.7) still has a singular point $P = (A_3 = B_2 + 1 = D_2 = 0)$. Blowing up again by defining $A_4 = \frac{A_3}{B_2+1}$, $B_3 = B_2 + 1$, $D_3 = \frac{D_2}{B_2+1}$, we have $k(A_3, B_2, D_2) = k(A_4, B_3, D_3)$ and

$$(3.8) \qquad 3D_3^2 = -12A_4^2B_3 + 3A_4^2 - 12A_4B_3 + 6A_4 - 4B_3 + 3.$$

Hence we obtain $k(x, y, z)^{\langle \rho^2 \rangle} = k(A_4, B_3, D_3) = k(A_4, D_3)$ because the equation (3.8) is linear in B_3.

The action of $D_6 = \langle \rho, \tau \rangle$ on $k(A_4, D_3)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &\rho : A_4 \mapsto \tfrac{A_4^2 + 2A_4 + 3D_3^2 + 1}{3A_4^2 + 2A_4 - 3D_3^2 - 1},\ D_3 \mapsto -\tfrac{4A_4D_3}{3A_4^2 + 2A_4 - 3D_3^2 - 1}, \\ &\tau : A_4 \mapsto A_4,\ D_3 \mapsto -D_3. \end{aligned}$$

Define $A_5 = A_4 + \frac{1}{3}$. Then the actions of ρ and τ on $k(A_5, D_3)$ are

$$\begin{aligned} &\rho : A_5 \mapsto \tfrac{2(3A_5^2 + 2A_5 + 3D_3^2)}{9(A_5^2 - D_3^2) - 4},\ D_3 \mapsto -\tfrac{4(3A_5 - 1)D_3}{9(A_5^2 - D_3^2) - 4}, \\ &\tau : A_5 \mapsto A_5,\ D_3 \mapsto -D_3. \end{aligned}$$

Put $A_6 = 3(A_5 + D_3)$, $D_4 = 3(A_5 - D_3)$. Then we have $k(A_5, D_3) = k(A_6, D_4)$ and

$$\rho : A_6 \mapsto \tfrac{2(2A_6 + D_4^2)}{A_6D_4 - 4},\ D_4 \mapsto \tfrac{2(A_6^2 + 2D_4)}{A_6D_4 - 4}, \quad \tau : A_6 \mapsto D_4,\ D_4 \mapsto A_6.$$

We put

$$(3.9) \qquad S = \frac{A_6D_4 - 4}{2(A_6 + D_4 - 2)}, \quad T = -\frac{D_4^2 - 2D_4 + 4}{2(A_6 + D_4 - 2)}.$$

Then we get $k(A_6, D_4) = k(S, T)$ and

$$\rho : S \mapsto \tfrac{1}{S},\ \tau \mapsto \tfrac{S + \frac{1}{S} - 1}{T}, \quad \tau : S \mapsto S,\ T \mapsto \tfrac{S(S + \frac{1}{S} - 1)}{T}.$$

With the aid of computers, it is not difficult to express S and T in terms of x and y as in the statement of this lemma.

Case 2. char $k = 2$.

The transcendental basis S, T obtained in (3.9) of Case 1 is also valid in case $\operatorname{char} k = 2$. In fact, the formulae of S and T in (3.2), when $\operatorname{char} k = 2$, become

$$S = \frac{x^2y + xy^2 + xy + 1}{x^2y^2 + xy + x + y}, \quad T = \frac{(xy + y + 1)(x^2y^2 + x^2y + x^2 + xy + x + 1)}{(xy + x + 1)(x^2y^2 + xy + x + y)}$$

Both of them are fixed by ρ^2. Moreover, they satisfy the following relations

$$y^3 + \frac{S^2T + S^2 + S + T^2 + 1}{S^3 + ST^2 + ST + T^2 + 1}y^2 + \frac{S^3 + S^2 + ST^2 + S + T}{S^3 + ST^2 + ST + T^2 + 1}y + 1 = 0,$$
$$x = \frac{(T + 1)y + S + T}{(S + T + 1)y^2 + (S + 1)y + S + T + 1}.$$

From $k(S,T) \subset k(x,y)^{\langle \rho^2 \rangle} \subset k(x,y)$ and $[k(x,y) : k(S,T)] \leq 3$, we find that $k(S,T) = k(x,y)^{\langle \rho^2 \rangle}$.

Case 3. $\operatorname{char} k = 3$.

The basis S, T in (3.9) is well defined also for the case of $\operatorname{char} k = 3$, but they collapse because $S + 2T + 1 = 0$. We will find another transcendental basis S, T.

By (3.3), we obtain $k(x,y)^{\langle \rho^2 \rangle} = k(A,B,D)$ and $D^2 = -A^3 + A^2B^2 - B^3$. Put $A_2 = \frac{A-B}{A+B}$, $D_2 = \frac{D}{AB}$. Then we get $k(A,B,D) = k(A_2,B,D_2)$ and

$$B(A_2 + 1)(A_2^2D_2^2 - A_2^2 - D_2^2 + 1) + 1 = 0.$$

Hence $k(x,y)^{\langle \rho^2 \rangle} = k(A_2,D_2)$. The actions of ρ and τ on $k(A_2,D_2)$ are given by

$$\rho : A_2 \mapsto -A_2,\ D_2 \mapsto -D_2, \quad \tau : A_2 \mapsto A_2,\ D_2 \mapsto -D_2.$$

Define $S = \frac{1+A_2}{1-A_2}$, $T = \frac{1+D_2}{1-D_2}$. Then we get $k(A_2,D_2) = k(S,T)$ and

$$\rho : S \mapsto \tfrac{1}{S},\ T \mapsto \tfrac{1}{T}, \quad \tau : S \mapsto S,\ T \mapsto \tfrac{1}{T}.$$

We may also express S and T in terms of x and y as in the statement of this lemma. Done. $\square$

§4. Proof of Theorem 1.14

Throughout this section, we adopt the following convention : If K/k is a quadratic separable extension, we will write $K = k(\alpha)$ with $\overline{\alpha} = -\alpha$ (resp. $\alpha + 1$) if $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$ (resp. $\operatorname{char} k = 2$) where $\overline{\alpha}$ is the image of α under the unique non-trivial k-automorphism of K. In order to shorten the wording, we simply say that K/k is a quadratic separable extension and $K = k(\alpha)$ with α suitably chosen.

Lemma 4.1 *Let k be a field, $f(x) \in k[x]$, and K/k a separable quadratic field extension with $K = k(\alpha)$ where $\alpha^2 = a \in k$* (if $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$) and $\alpha^2 + \alpha = a \in k$ (if $\operatorname{char} k = 2$). Write $Gal(K/k) = \langle \sigma \rangle$. Extend the action of σ to $K(x, y)$ by

$$\sigma : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ x \mapsto x,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{f(x)}{y}.$$

Denote by $\mathrm{Br}(K/k)$ the subgroup consisting of those elements in the Brauer group $\mathrm{Br}(k)$, which are split over K; denote by $(a, b)_k$ the norm residue 2-symbol over k, and by $[a, b)_k$ the norm residue 2-symbol over k where the first variable is additive and the second variable is multiplicative.

1. When $f(x) = b$, $K(x, y)^{\langle \sigma \rangle}$ is rational over k if and only if (i) $(a, b)_k = 0$ when $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$, or (ii) $[a, b)_k = 0$ when $\operatorname{char} k = 2$.
2. When $\deg f(x) = 1$, $K(x, y)^{\langle \sigma \rangle}$ is always rational over k.
3. When $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$ and $f(x) = b(x^2 - c)$ for some $b, c \in k \backslash \{0\}$, then $K(x, y)^{\langle \sigma \rangle}$ is rational over k if and only if $(a, b)_k \in \mathrm{Br}(k(\sqrt{ac})/k)$.
4. When $\operatorname{char} k = 2$ and $f(x) = b(x^2 + x + c)$ for some $b, c \in k$ with $b \neq 0$, then $K(x, y)^{\langle \sigma \rangle}$ is rational over k if and only if $[a, b)_k \in \mathrm{Br}(k(\beta)/k)$ where $\beta^2 + \beta = a + c$.
5. When $\operatorname{char} k = 2$ and $f(x) = b(x^2 + c)$ for some $b, c \in k \backslash \{0\}$, then $K(x, y)^{\langle \sigma \rangle}$ is rational over k if and only if $[a, b)_k \in \mathrm{Br}(k(\sqrt{c})/k)$.

Moreover, if $K(x, y)^{\langle \sigma \rangle}$ is not k-rational, then k is an infinite field, the Brauer group $\mathrm{Br}(k)$ is non-trivial, and $K(x, y)^{\langle \sigma \rangle}$ is not k-unirational.

Proof. Except for the last statement, the theorem was proved in [HKO, Theorem 6.7]; also see [HK2, Theorem 2.4; Ka3, Theorem 4.2].

Now we will prove the last statement. The field k is infinite because some norm residue 2-symbol is not zero and the proof to proving k is infinite in the proof of Proposition 1.13 is valid at the present situation. It remains to show that $K(x, y)^{\langle \sigma \rangle}$ is not k-unirational.

As an illustration, consider (4) where $\operatorname{char} k = 2$ and $f(x) = b(x^2 + x + c)$. It is easy to show that $K(x, y)^{\langle \sigma \rangle}$ is k-isomorphic to the function field of the hypersurface $\{P(X, Y, U) = X^2 - XY - aY^2 - b(U^2 - U - c) = 0\}$ in the 3-dimensional affine space over k where X, Y, U are the coordinates (see, for example, [HKO, Theorem, page 402]). By [HKO, Theorem 2.2], this function field is k-rational if and only if it is k-unirational (note that k-unirational is called subrational over k in [HKO, page 386]). This finishes the proof.

Similarly, the field $K(x, y)^{\langle \sigma \rangle}$ in (5) corresponds to the hypersurface defined by $\{P(X, Y, U) = X^2 - XY - aY^2 - b(U^2 - c) = 0\}$; the field in (3) corresponds to the hypersurface defined by $\{P(X, Y, U) = X^2 - aY^2 - b(U^2 - c) = 0\}$; the field in (1) corresponds to the hypersurface defined by $\{P(X, Y, U) = X^2 - aY^2 - b = 0\}$ (resp. $\{P(X, Y, U) = X^2 - XY - aY^2 - b = 0\}$. Apply [HKO, Theorem 2.2] to these fields. Hence the result. $\square$

Example 4.2 Take $k = \mathbb{Q}$, $a = -1$, $f(x) = -(x^2 + 1)$. By Lemma 4.1, we find that $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-1})(x, y)^{\langle\sigma\rangle}$ is not $\mathbb{Q}$-unirational. By defining $2u = y + \frac{f(x)}{y}$ and $2v = \sqrt{-1}\,(y - \frac{f(x)}{y})$, we obtain $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-1})(x, y)^{\langle\sigma\rangle} = \mathbb{Q}(x, u, v)$ with the relation $u^2 + v^2 = -x^2 - 1$. Note that the field $\mathbb{Q}(x, u, v)$ has no $\mathbb{Q}$-rational place (i.e. $\mathbb{Q}$-rational point).

On the other hand, take $k = \mathbb{R}$, $a = -1$, $f(x) = x^3 - 3x$. Then $\mathbb{R}(\sqrt{-1})(x, y)^{\langle\sigma\rangle} \simeq \mathbb{R}(x, u, v)$ with the relation $u^2 + v^2 = x^3 - 3x$. We claim that $\mathbb{R}(x, u, v)$ is $\mathbb{R}$-unirational, but not $\mathbb{R}$-rational. For the $\mathbb{R}$-unirationality, the map $\phi : \mathbb{R}[U, V, X]/\langle U^2 + V^2 - X^3 + 3X\rangle \to \mathbb{R}(s, t)$ defined by $\phi(U) = \frac{s(3+s^2)(1-t^2)-2\sqrt{2}t}{1+t^2}$, $\phi(V) = \frac{2st(3+s^2)+\sqrt{2}(1-t^2)}{1+t^2}$, $\phi(X) = 2 + s^2$ gives an embedding of $\mathbb{R}(x, u, v)$ into $\mathbb{R}(s, t)$ [Oj, page 9]. The irrationality of $\mathbb{R}(x, u, v)$ follows from Iskovskikh's criterion (see, for example, [Ka3, Theorem 4.3]); the reader may consult [Oj, pages 10-12; pages 81-83] for other proofs. The example of a real algebraic surface which is unirational, but not rational is constructed by B. Segre in 1951 [Oj, page iv].

Nagata asks the following question [Na, page 90] : Let k be an algebraically closed field, f_1, f_2, f_3 be non-zero polynomials in the polynomial ring $k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$, L be the field $k(x_1, \ldots, x_n, u, v)$ satisfying the relation $f_1u^2 + f_2v^2 = f_3$. Is it possible to find such a field L which is not k-unirational? So far as we know, this question is still an open problem.

Proof of Theorem 1.14.

Let G act on $K(x, y)$ by purely quasi-monomial k-automorphisms and N, H the subgroups of G defined in the statement of Theorem 1.14.

Note that $K(x, y)^G = \{K(x, y)^N\}^{G/N}$ and G/N acts on $K^N(x, y)$ by purely monomial k-automorphisms. Without loss of generality, we may assume $N = \{1\}$. Thus $\rho : G \to GL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ is injective where ρ is the group homomorphism defined in Definition 1.11. In particular, G is isomorphic to a finite subgroup of $GL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ and we may apply Theorem 3.1 to write down the action of G on x and y.

If $H = \{1\}$, i.e. G acts faithfully on K, then $K(x, y)^G$ is k-rational by Theorem 1.3.

If $H = G$, i.e. $k = K$, then G acts on $k(x, y)$ by purely monomial k-automorphisms. Thus $k(x, y)^G$ is k-rational by Theorem 1.6.

It remains to consider the case $\{1\} \subsetneq H \subsetneq G$ and $H \lhd G$.

Since $\rho : G \to GL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ is injective, $\rho(H)$ is a non-trivial proper normal subgroup of $\rho(G)$. From Theorem 3.1, it is easy to see that only 8 groups have a non-trivial proper normal subgroup: $V_4^{(1)}$, $V_4^{(2)}$, C_4, $S_3^{(1)}$, $S_3^{(2)}$, C_6, D_4 and D_6.

Case 1. $G \simeq V_4^{(1)} = \langle\lambda, -I\rangle$.

The non-trivial proper normal subgroups H of G are $\langle -I\rangle$, $\langle\lambda\rangle$, and $\langle -\lambda\rangle$.

Subcase 1.1. $(G, H) \simeq (V_4^{(1)}, \langle -I\rangle)$. Thus λ acts faithfully on K and $[K : k] = 2$. Write $K = k(\alpha)$ with $\lambda(\alpha) = \overline{\alpha}$ where α is chosen suitably. The group $G = \langle -I, \lambda\rangle$ acts on $K(x, y)$ by

$$-I : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x},\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y}, \quad \lambda : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ x \mapsto x,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y}.$$

By Lemma 3.3 we have $K(x,y)^H = K(s,t)$ where s and t are given as in (3.1), and λ acts on $K(s,t)$ by

$$\lambda : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ s \mapsto \tfrac{1}{s},\ t \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{1}{t} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 2, \\ t & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 2. \end{cases}$$

Hence

$$K(x,y)^G = K(s,t)^{\langle \lambda \rangle} = \begin{cases} k(\alpha \frac{s+1}{s-1}, \alpha \frac{t+1}{t-1}) & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 2, \\ k(\alpha + \frac{1}{s+1}, t) & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 2, \end{cases}$$

is k-rational.

Subcase 1.2. $(G,H) \simeq (V_4^{(1)}, \langle \lambda \rangle)$. Again $[K:k] = 2$ and write $K = k(\alpha)$ with α suitably chosen. The group G acts on $K(x,y)$ by

$$\lambda : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto x,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y}, \quad -I : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x},\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y}.$$

We have $K(x,y)^H = K(u,v)$ where $u = x$ and $v = y + \frac{1}{y}$, and $-I$ acts on $K(u,v)$ by

$$-I : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ u \mapsto \tfrac{1}{u},\ v \mapsto v.$$

Hence

$$K(x,y)^G = K(u,v)^{\langle -I \rangle} = \begin{cases} k(\alpha \frac{u+1}{u-1}, v) & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 2, \\ k(\alpha + \frac{1}{u+1}, v) & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 2 \end{cases}$$

is k-rational.

Subcase 1.3. $(G,H) \simeq (V_4^{(1)}, \langle -\lambda \rangle)$.

The group G acts on $K(x,y)$ by

$$-\lambda : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto \frac{1}{x},\ y \mapsto y, \quad -I : \alpha \mapsto \bar{\alpha},\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x},\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y}$$

where $[K:k] = 2$ and $K = k(\alpha)$ with α chosen suitably. This is essentially the same situation as in Subcase 1.2.

Case 2. $G \simeq V_4^{(2)} = \langle \tau, -I \rangle$.

The non-trivial proper normal subgroups H of G are $\langle -I \rangle$, $\langle \tau \rangle$ and $\langle -\tau \rangle$.

Subcase 2.1. $(G,H) \simeq (V_4^{(2)}, \langle -I \rangle)$. We have $[K:k] = 2$ and $K = k(\alpha)$ with α chosen suitably.

The proof is similar by using Lemma 3.2. The details are omitted.

Subcase 2.2. $(G,H) \simeq (V_4^{(2)}, \langle \tau \rangle)$. Write $K = k(\alpha)$ with α suitably chosen. The group G acts on $K(x,y)$ by

$$\tau : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto x, \quad -I : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x},\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y}.$$

We have $K(x,y)^{\langle\tau\rangle} = K(u,v)$ where $u := x+y$ and $v := (x+y)/xy$, and $-I$ acts on $K(u,v)$ by

$$-I : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ u \mapsto v,\ v \mapsto u.$$

Hence

$$K(x,y)^G = K(s,t)^{\langle -I\rangle} = \begin{cases} k(u+v, \alpha(u-v)) & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 2, \\ k(u+v, \alpha + \frac{u}{u+v}) & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 2 \end{cases}$$

is k-rational.

Subcase 2.3. $(G,H) = (V_4^{(2)}, \langle -\tau\rangle)$. The group G acts on $K(x,y)$ by

$$-\tau : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y},\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x}, \quad -I : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x},\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y}$$

where $[K:k] = 2$ and $K = k(\alpha)$ with α chosen suitably. Define $y' = 1/y$. We have

$$-\tau : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto y',\ y' \mapsto x, \quad -I : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x},\ y' \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y'}$$

This is the same action as in Subcase 2.2. Done.

Case 3. $G \simeq C_4 = \langle\sigma\rangle$.

The non-trivial proper normal subgroup N of G is $\langle -I\rangle$. The action is given by

$$-I = \sigma^2 : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x},\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y}, \quad \sigma : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x}$$

where $[K:k] = 2$ and $K = k(\alpha)$ with α chosen suitably. By Lemma 3.3 we have $K(x,y)^N = K(s,t)$ where s and t are given as in (3.1), and σ acts on $K(s,t)$ by

$$\sigma : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ s \mapsto \tfrac{1}{s},\ t \mapsto \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{t} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 2, \\ \frac{1}{t} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 2. \end{cases}$$

If $\operatorname{char} k = 2$ then $K(x,y)^G = K(s,t)^{\langle\sigma\rangle}$ is k-rational by Theorem 1.3.

When $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$, apply Lemma 4.1. By defining $a = \alpha^2 \in k$ and $x = \alpha\frac{s+1}{s-1}$, we find that $K(x,y)^G$ is k-rational if and only if $(a,-1)_k = 0$. If $K(x,y)^G$ is not k-rational, it is not k-unirational by the last assertion of Lemma 4.1. This finishes the proof of the first exceptional case in Theorem 1.14.

Case 4. $G \simeq S_3^{(1)} = \langle\rho^2, \tau\rangle$.

The non-trivial proper normal subgroup N of G is $\langle\rho^2\rangle$. We consider the following actions:

$$\rho^2 : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{xy}, \quad \tau : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto x$$

where $[K:k] = 2$ and $K = k(\alpha)$ with α chosen suitably. We have $K(x,y)^{\langle\rho^2\rangle} = K(S,T)$ where S and T are defined in Lemma 3.4, and the action of τ on $K(S,T)$ is given by

$$\tau : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ S \mapsto S,\ T \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{S(S+\frac{1}{S}-1)}{T} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 3, \\ \frac{1}{T} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 3. \end{cases}$$

Hence $K(x,y)^G = K(S,T)^{\langle\tau\rangle}$ is k-rational by Lemma 4.1.

Case 5. $G \simeq S_3^{(2)} = \langle \rho^2, -\tau\rangle$.

The non-trivial proper normal subgroup N of G is $\langle\rho^2\rangle$. We consider the following actions:

$$\rho^2 : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{xy}, \quad -\tau : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y},\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x}$$

where $K = k(\alpha)$ and $[K:k] = 2$ with α suitably chosen. We have $K(x,y)^{\langle\rho^2\rangle} = K(S,T)$ where S and T are defined in Lemma 3.4, and the action of $-\tau$ on $K(S,T)$ is given by

$$-\tau : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ S \mapsto \tfrac{1}{S},\ T \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{T}{S} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 3, \\ T & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 3. \end{cases}$$

$K(x,y)^G = K(S,T)^{\langle -\tau\rangle}$ is k-rational by Theorem 1.3.

Case 6. $G \simeq C_6 = \langle\rho\rangle$.

The non-trivial proper normal subgroups N of G are $\langle -I\rangle$ and $\langle\rho^2\rangle$.

Subcase 6.1. $(G,H) \simeq (C_6, \langle -I\rangle)$. The group G acts on $K(x,y)$ by

$$-I : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x},\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y}, \quad \rho : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ x \mapsto xy,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x}$$

where $K = k(\alpha)$ and $[K:k] = 3$ with α as before. By Lemma 3.3, we get $K(x,y)^{\langle -I\rangle} = K(s,t)$ where s and t are given as in (3.1), and ρ acts on $K(s,t)$ by

$$\rho : s \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{s-t}{s+t-2st}, \\ \frac{t}{s(t+1)+1}, \end{cases} \quad t \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{-s+t}{s+t+2st} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 2, \\ \frac{1}{s(t+1)} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 2. \end{cases}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \frac{-2t}{s-t+2st}, & B &= \frac{s+t-2st}{2t}, & &\text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 2; \\ A &= s(t+1), & B &= \frac{t}{s(t+1)}, & &\text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 2. \end{aligned}$$

Then $K(x,y)^{\langle -I\rangle} = K(s,t) = K(A,B)$ and ρ acts on $K(A,B)$ by

$$\rho : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ A \mapsto B,\ B \mapsto \tfrac{1}{AB}.$$

$K(x,y)^G = K(A,B)^{\langle\rho\rangle}$ is k-rational by Theorem 1.3.

Subcase 6.2. $(G,H) \simeq (C_6, \langle\rho^2\rangle)$. The group G acts on $K(x,y)$ by

$$\rho^2 : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{xy}, \quad \rho : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ x \mapsto xy,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x}$$

where $K = k(\alpha)$ and $[K : k] = 2$ with α as before. We have $K(x,y)^{\langle\rho^2\rangle} = K(S,T)$ where S and T are defined in Lemma 3.4, and ρ acts on $K(S,T)$ by

$$\rho : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ S \mapsto \tfrac{1}{S},\ T \mapsto \begin{cases} (S + \frac{1}{S} - 1)/T & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 3, \\ \frac{1}{T} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 3. \end{cases}$$

When $\operatorname{char} k = 3$, $K(x,y)^G = k(\alpha\frac{S+1}{S-1}, \alpha\frac{T+1}{T-1})$ is rational over k.

When $\operatorname{char} k = 2$, define

$$U := \frac{S}{S+1} + \alpha, \quad V := \frac{T}{S+1}.$$

Then $K(S,T) = K(U,V)$ and ρ acts on $K(U,V)$ by

$$\rho : \alpha \mapsto \alpha + 1,\ U \mapsto U,\ V \mapsto \tfrac{U^2+U+a+1}{V}$$

where $a = \alpha(\alpha + 1)$. By Lemma 4.1 (4), $K(x,y)^G = K(U,V)^{\langle\rho\rangle}$ is k-rational because $[a,1)_k = 0$.

When $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2, 3$, define

$$U := \frac{S+1}{S-1}, \quad V := (U-1)T.$$

Then $K(S,T) = K(U,V)$ and ρ acts on $K(U,V)$ by

$$\rho : \alpha \mapsto -\alpha,\ U \mapsto -U,\ V \mapsto -(U^2+3)/V.$$

Define $W := U/\alpha$. We find that

$$\rho : \alpha \mapsto -\alpha,\ W \mapsto W,\ T \mapsto -(aW^2+3)/T.$$

Apply Lemma 4.1 (3). We obtain $K(x,y)^G = K(W,T)^{\langle\rho\rangle}$ is k-rational because $(a,-a)_k = 0$.

Case 7. $G \simeq D_4 = \langle\sigma,\tau\rangle$.

The non-trivial proper normal subgroups N of G are $\langle -I\rangle$, $\langle -I,\lambda\rangle$, $\langle -I,\tau\rangle$ and $\langle\sigma\rangle$ where $\lambda = \tau\sigma$.

Subcase 7.1. $(G,H) = (D_4, \langle -I\rangle)$.

Since $G/H = \langle\sigma,\tau\rangle \simeq V_4$ acts faithfully on K, we may write $K = k(\alpha,\beta)$ with α, β suitably chosen and $[K : k] = 4$.

The group G acts on $K(x,y)$ by

$$-I : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ \beta \mapsto \beta,\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x},\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y}, \quad \sigma : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ \beta \mapsto \beta,\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x},$$
$$\tau : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ \beta \mapsto \overline{\beta},\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto x.$$

By Lemma 3.3, we have $K(x,y)^{\langle -I\rangle}=K(s,t)$ where s and t are given as in (3.1), and the actions of σ and τ on $K(s,t)$ are given by

$$\sigma:\alpha\mapsto\overline{\alpha},\ \beta\mapsto\beta,\ s\mapsto\tfrac{1}{s},\ t\mapsto\begin{cases}-\frac{1}{t} & \text{if }\operatorname{char}k\neq 2,\\ \frac{1}{t} & \text{if }\operatorname{char}k=2,\end{cases}$$

$$\tau:\alpha\mapsto\alpha,\ \beta\mapsto\overline{\beta},\ s\mapsto s,\ t\mapsto\begin{cases}-t & \text{if }\operatorname{char}k\neq 2,\\ \frac{1}{t} & \text{if }\operatorname{char}k=2.\end{cases}$$

When $\operatorname{char}k=2$, $K(x,y)^G=K(s,t)^{\langle\sigma,\tau\rangle}$ is k-rational by Theorem 1.3.

When $\operatorname{char}k\neq 2$, we put

$$S:=\frac{\alpha(s+1)}{s-1},\quad T:=\beta t,$$

then $K(s,t)^{\langle\tau\rangle}=k(\alpha)(S,T)$ and σ acts on $k(\alpha)(S,T)$ by

$$\sigma:\alpha\mapsto\overline{\alpha},\ \beta\mapsto\beta,\ S\mapsto S,\ T\mapsto\tfrac{-b}{T}.$$

By Lemma 4.1 (1), $K(x,y)^G=k(\alpha)(S,T)^{\langle\sigma\rangle}$ is k-rational if and only if $(a,-b)_k=0$. If $K(x,y)^G$ is not k-rational, it is not k-unirational by the last assertion of Lemma 4.1. This completes the proof of the second exceptional case in Theorem 1.14.

Subcase 7.2. $(G,H)\simeq(D_4,\langle -I,\lambda\rangle)$, $N=\langle -I,\lambda\rangle$.

The group G acts on $K(x,y)$ by

$$\begin{aligned}&-I:\alpha\mapsto\alpha,\ x\mapsto\tfrac{1}{x},\ y\mapsto\tfrac{1}{y},\qquad \lambda:\alpha\mapsto\alpha,\ x\mapsto x,\ y\mapsto\tfrac{1}{y},\\ &\tau:\alpha\mapsto\overline{\alpha},\ x\mapsto y,\ y\mapsto x\end{aligned}$$

where $K=k(\alpha)$ and $[K:k]=2$. By Lemma 3.3, $K(x,y)^{\langle -I\rangle}=K(s,t)$ where s and t are given as in (3.1), and λ and τ act on $K(s,t)$ by

$$\lambda:\alpha\mapsto\alpha,\ s\mapsto\tfrac{1}{s},\ t\mapsto\begin{cases}\frac{1}{t} & \text{if }\operatorname{char}k\neq 2,\\ t & \text{if }\operatorname{char}k=2,\end{cases}$$

$$\tau:\alpha\mapsto\overline{\alpha},\ s\mapsto s,\ t\mapsto\begin{cases}-t & \text{if }\operatorname{char}k\neq 2,\\ \frac{1}{t} & \text{if }\operatorname{char}k=2.\end{cases}$$

When $\operatorname{char}k=2$, the action is the same as that in Subcase 1.3. Hence the result.

When $\operatorname{char}k\neq 2$, by Lemma 3.3 again, we have $K(s,t)^{\langle\lambda\rangle}=K(u,v)$ where $u=(st+1)/(s+t)$ and $v=(st-1)/(s-t)$, and τ acts on $K(u,v)$ by

$$\tau:\alpha\mapsto-\alpha,\ u\mapsto-v,\ v\mapsto-u.$$

Thus $K(x,y)^G=K(u,v)^{\langle\tau\rangle}=k(\alpha(u+v),u-v)$ is k-rational.

Subcase 7.3. $(G,H) \simeq (D_4, \langle -I, \lambda\rangle)$. The group G acts on $K(x,y)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} -I &: \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x},\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y}, \quad \tau : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto x, \\ \sigma &: \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x} \end{aligned}$$

where $K = k(\alpha)$ and $[K:k] = 2$. By Lemma 3.3, $K(x,y)^{\langle -I\rangle} = K(s,t)$ where s and t are given as in (3.1), and τ and σ act on $K(s,t)$ by

$$\tau : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ s \mapsto s,\ t \mapsto \begin{cases} -t & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 2, \\ \frac{1}{t} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 2, \end{cases}$$

$$\sigma : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ s \mapsto \tfrac{1}{s},\ t \mapsto \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{t} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 2, \\ \frac{1}{t} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 2. \end{cases}$$

When $\operatorname{char} k = 2$, the action is the same as in Subcase 1.2. Done.

When $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$, $K(s,t)^{\langle\tau\rangle} = K(s,t')$ where $t' = t^2$. It follows that $K(s,t)^{\langle\tau,\sigma\rangle} = k(s,t')^{\langle\sigma\rangle}$ is k-rational.

Subcase 7.4. $(G,H) \simeq (D_4, \langle\sigma\rangle)$. The group G acts on $K(x,y)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} -I &: \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x},\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y}, \quad \sigma : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x}, \\ \tau &: \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto x \end{aligned}$$

where $K = k(\alpha)$ and $[K:k] = 2$. By Lemma 3.3, $K(x,y)^{\langle -I\rangle} = K(s,t)$ where s and t are given as in (3.1), and τ and σ act on $K(s,t)$ by

$$\sigma : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ s \mapsto \tfrac{1}{s},\ t \mapsto \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{t} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 2, \\ \frac{1}{t} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 2, \end{cases}$$

$$\tau : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ s \mapsto s,\ t \mapsto \begin{cases} -t & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 2, \\ \frac{1}{t} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 2. \end{cases}$$

When $\operatorname{char} k = 2$, this is the same action as in Subcase 1.1. Hence $k(x,y)^G$ is k-rational.

When $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$, by Lemma 3.2, $K(s,t)^{\langle\sigma\rangle} = K(u,v)$ where

$$u = \frac{s - \frac{1}{s}}{st + \frac{1}{st}}, \quad v = \frac{t + \frac{1}{t}}{st + \frac{1}{st}}$$

and τ acts on $K(u,v)$ by

$$\tau : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ u \mapsto -u,\ v \mapsto v.$$

Thus $K(x,y)^G = K(u,v)^{\langle\tau\rangle} = k(\alpha u, v)$ is k-rational.

Case 8. $G \simeq D_6 = \langle \rho, \tau \rangle$.

The non-trivial proper normal subgroups N of G are $\langle -I\rangle$, $\langle \rho^2\rangle$, $\langle \rho\rangle$, $\langle \rho^2, \tau\rangle$ and $\langle \rho^2, -\tau\rangle$.

Subcase 8.1. $(G, H) \simeq (D_6, \langle -I\rangle)$.

By the same calculation as in Subcase 6.1, ρ and τ act on $K(x,y)^{\langle -I\rangle} = K(A,B)$ by

$$\rho : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ A \mapsto B,\ B \mapsto \tfrac{1}{AB}, \quad \tau : \beta \mapsto \overline{\beta},\ A \mapsto \tfrac{1}{B},\ B \mapsto \tfrac{1}{A}$$

where $K = k(\alpha, \beta)$, $[K : k] = 6$ and $\langle \rho, \tau\rangle$ acts on K faithfully. Hence $K(x,y)^G = K(A,B)^{\langle \rho,\tau\rangle}$ is k-rational by Theorem 1.3.

Subcase 8.2. $(G, H) \simeq (D_6, \langle \rho^2\rangle)$.

The group G acts on $K(x,y)$ by

$$\begin{aligned}&\rho^2 : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ \beta \mapsto \beta,\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{xy}, \quad -\tau : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ \beta \mapsto \beta,\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y},\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x},\\ &\tau : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ \beta \mapsto \overline{\beta},\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto x\end{aligned}$$

where $K = k(\alpha, \beta)$ and $[K : k] = 4$. We have $K(x,y)^{\langle \rho^2\rangle} = K(S,T)$ where S and T are defined in Lemma 3.4 and $-\tau$ and τ act on $K(S,T)$ by

$$-\tau : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ \beta \mapsto \beta,\ S \mapsto \tfrac{1}{S},\ T \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{T}{S} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 3,\\ T & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 3,\end{cases}$$

$$\tau : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ \beta \mapsto \overline{\beta},\ S \mapsto S,\ T \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{S(S+\frac{1}{S}-1)}{T} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 3,\\ \frac{1}{T} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 3.\end{cases}$$

When $\operatorname{char} k = 3$, $K(x,y)^G = K(S,T)^{\langle -\tau, \tau\rangle}$ is k-rational by Theorem 1.3.

When $\operatorname{char} k = 2$, $K(x,y)^{\langle -\tau\rangle} = K(U,V)$ where

$$U = \alpha + \frac{S}{S+1}, \quad V = \frac{T}{S+1},$$

and τ acts on $K(U,V)$ by

$$\tau : \beta \mapsto \overline{\beta},\ U \mapsto U,\ V \mapsto \tfrac{U^2+U+a+1}{V}$$

where $a = \alpha(\alpha+1)$. By Lemma 4.1 (4), $K(x,y)^G = K(U,V)^{\langle \tau\rangle}$ is k-rational.

When $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2, 3$, define

$$U := \frac{S+1}{S-1}, \quad V := (U-1)T.$$

Then $-\tau$ acts on $K(S,T) = K(U,V)$ by

$$-\tau : \alpha \mapsto -\alpha,\ \beta \mapsto \beta,\ U \mapsto -U,\ V \mapsto -V.$$

Define $P = V/\alpha$ and $Q = U/\alpha$. It follows that $K(U,V)^{\langle -\tau\rangle} = k(\beta)(P,Q)$ and τ acts on $k(\beta)(P,Q)$ by

$$\tau : \beta \mapsto -\beta,\ P \mapsto \tfrac{Q^2+3/a}{P},\ Q \mapsto Q.$$

Thus $K(x,y)^G = k(\beta)(P,Q)^{\langle\tau\rangle}$ is k-rational by Lemma 4.1 (3).

Subcase 8.3. $(G,H) \simeq (D_6, \langle\rho\rangle)$.

The group G acts on $K(x,y)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} -I &: \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x},\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y}, \quad \rho : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto xy,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x}, \\ \tau &: \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto x \end{aligned}$$

where $K = k(\alpha)$ and $[K:k] = 2$. By the same calculation as in Subcase 6.1, we have $K(x,y)^{\langle -I\rangle} = K(A,B)$ where A and B are the same given there in Subcase 6.1, and ρ and τ act on $K(A,B)$ by

$$\rho : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ A \mapsto B,\ B \mapsto \tfrac{1}{AB}, \quad \tau : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ A \mapsto \tfrac{1}{B},\ B \mapsto \tfrac{1}{A}.$$

These actions are the same as in the case of $G = S_3^{(1)}$ in Case 5. Thus $K(x,y)^G = K(A,B)^{\langle\rho,\tau\rangle}$ is k-rational.

Subcase 8.4. $(G,H) \simeq (D_6, \langle\rho^2,\tau\rangle)$.

The group G acts on $K(x,y)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^2 &: \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{xy}, \quad \tau : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto x, \\ \rho &: \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ x \mapsto xy,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x} \end{aligned}$$

where $K = k(\alpha)$ and $[K:k] = 2$. We have $K(x,y)^{\langle\rho^2\rangle} = K(S,T)$ where S and T are defined in Lemma 3.4, and τ and ρ act on $K(S,T)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &: \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ S \mapsto S,\ T \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{S(S+\frac{1}{S}-1)}{T} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 3, \\ \frac{1}{T} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 3, \end{cases} \\ \rho &: \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ S \mapsto \frac{1}{S},\ T \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{S+\frac{1}{S}-1}{T} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 3, \\ \frac{1}{T} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 3. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

When $\operatorname{char} k = 3$, $K(x,y)^G = K(S,T)^{\langle\tau,\rho\rangle} = K(S, T+\frac{1}{T})^{\langle\rho\rangle} = k(\alpha(S+1)/(S-1), T+\frac{1}{T})$ is k-rational.

When $\operatorname{char} k \neq 3$, define

$$U := S, \quad V := T + \frac{S(S+\frac{1}{S}-1)}{T}.$$

Then $K(S,T)^{\langle\tau\rangle} = K(U,V)$ and ρ acts on $K(U,V)$ by

$$\rho : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ U \mapsto \tfrac{1}{U},\ V \mapsto \tfrac{V}{U}.$$

Thus $K(x,y)^G = K(U,V)^{\langle\rho\rangle}$ is k-rational by Theorem 1.3.

Subcase 8.5. $(G,H) = (D_6, \langle\rho^2, -\tau\rangle)$.

The group G acts on $K(x,y)$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^2 &: \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{xy}, \quad -\tau : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y},\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x},\\ \rho &: \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ x \mapsto xy,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x}\end{aligned}$$

where $K = k(\alpha)$ and $[K:k] = 2$. We have $K(x,y)^{\langle\rho^2\rangle} = K(S,T)$ where S and T are defined in Lemma 3.4 and the actions of τ and ρ on $K(S,T)$ are given by

$$-\tau : \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ S \mapsto \tfrac{1}{S},\ T \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{T}{S} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 3,\\ T & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 3,\end{cases}$$

$$\rho : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ S \mapsto \tfrac{1}{S},\ T \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{S+\frac{1}{S}-1}{T} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k \neq 3,\\ \frac{1}{T} & \text{if } \operatorname{char} k = 3.\end{cases}$$

If $\operatorname{char} k = 3$, then $K(x,y)^{\langle\rho^2,-\tau,\rho\rangle} = K(S,T)^{\langle -\tau,\rho\rangle} = K(S+\frac{1}{S}, T)^{\langle\rho\rangle} = k(S+\frac{1}{S}, \alpha(T+1)/(T-1))$ is k-rational.

If $\operatorname{char} k \neq 3$, define

$$U := \frac{T(S+1)}{S}, \quad V := \frac{T^2}{S},$$

then $K(S,T)^{\langle -\tau\rangle} = K(U,V)$ and the action of ρ on $K(U,V)$ is given by

$$\rho : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ U \mapsto \tfrac{U(U^2-3V)}{V^2},\ V \mapsto \tfrac{(U^2-3V)^2}{V^3}.$$

Define $W := (U^2-3V)/V$. We find that

$$\rho : \alpha \mapsto \overline{\alpha},\ U \mapsto \tfrac{W^2+3W}{U},\ W \mapsto W.$$

Apply Lemma 4.1 (3), (4). We find $K(x,y)^G = K(U,W)^{\langle\rho\rangle}$ is k-rational. $\square$

Saltman discussed the relationship of $K_\alpha(M)^G$ and the embedding problem in [Sa3]; in particular, see Section 3 of [Sa3]. In the following, we reformulate the two exceptional cases of Theorem 1.14 in terms of the embedding problem.

Proposition 4.3 (1) *Let k be a field with $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$, $a \in k\backslash k^2$ and $K = k(\sqrt{a})$. Let $G = \langle\sigma\rangle$ act on $K(x,y)$ by*

$$\sigma : \sqrt{a} \mapsto -\sqrt{a},\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x},\ y \mapsto -\tfrac{1}{y}.$$

Then $K(x,y)^G$ is rational over k if and only if the quadratic extension $k(\sqrt{a})/k$ can be embedded into a C_4-extension of k, i.e. there is a Galois extension L/k such that $k \subset k(\sqrt{a}) \subset L$ and $\operatorname{Gal}(L/k) \simeq C_4$.

(2) *Let k be a field with* $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$, $a, b \in k \backslash k^2$ *such that* $[K : k] = 4$ *where* $K = k(\sqrt{a}, \sqrt{b})$. *Let* $G = \langle \sigma, \tau \rangle \simeq D_4$ *act on* $K(x, y)$ *by*

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &: \sqrt{a} \mapsto -\sqrt{a},\ \sqrt{b} \mapsto \sqrt{b},\ x \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x},\ y \mapsto -\tfrac{1}{y}, \\ \tau &: \sqrt{a} \mapsto \sqrt{a},\ \sqrt{b} \mapsto -\sqrt{b},\ x \mapsto x,\ y \mapsto -y. \end{aligned}$$

Then $K(x, y)^G$ *is rational over* k *if and only if there is a Galois extension* L/k *such that* $k \subset K \subset L$ *and* $\operatorname{Gal}(L/k) \simeq D_4$.

Proof. Check the proof of Case 3 and Subcase 7.1 of Theorem 1.14, and use the well-known results of the embedding problem. For example, for the obstruction to the $1 \to C_2 \to C_4 \to C_2 \to 1$, see [La, Exercise 8, page 217; Ki, page 837; Le, page 37]; for the obstruction to the $1 \to C_2 \to D_4 \to C_2 \times C_2 \to 1$, see [Ki, page 840; Le, page 38]. □

Example 4.4 Let k be a field of $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$, $K = k(\alpha, \beta)$ be a biquadratic extension of k. We consider the following actions of k-automorphisms of $D_4 = \langle \sigma, \tau \rangle$ on $K(x, y)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_\alpha &: \alpha \mapsto -\alpha,\ \beta \mapsto \beta,\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x}, \\ \sigma_\beta &: \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ \beta \mapsto -\beta,\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x}, \\ \sigma_{\alpha\beta} &: \alpha \mapsto -\alpha,\ \beta \mapsto -\beta,\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x}, \\ \tau_\alpha &: \alpha \mapsto -\alpha,\ \beta \mapsto \beta,\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto x, \\ \tau_\beta &: \alpha \mapsto \alpha,\ \beta \mapsto -\beta,\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto x, \\ \tau_{\alpha\beta} &: \alpha \mapsto -\alpha,\ \beta \mapsto -\beta,\ x \mapsto y,\ y \mapsto x. \end{aligned}$$

Define $L_{\alpha,\beta} = K(x, y)^{\langle \sigma_\alpha, \tau_\beta \rangle}$ where $a = \alpha^2$ and $b = \beta^2$. It is not difficult to verify that

(1) $L_{\alpha,\beta}$ is rational over k iff $L_{\alpha,\alpha\beta}$ is rational over k iff $(a, -b)_k = 0$,

(2) $L_{\beta,\alpha}$ is rational over k iff $L_{\beta,\alpha\beta}$ is rational over k iff $(b, -a)_k = 0$,

(3) $L_{\alpha\beta,\alpha}$ is rational over k iff $L_{\alpha\beta,\beta}$ is rational over k iff $(a, b)_k = 0$.

In particular, if $\sqrt{-1} \in k$ then the rationality of the six fixed fields $L_{\alpha,\beta}$, $L_{\alpha,\alpha\beta}$, $L_{\beta,\alpha}$, $L_{\beta,\alpha\beta}$, $L_{\alpha\beta,\alpha}$ and $L_{\alpha\beta,\beta}$ over k coincide.

On the other hand, consider the case $k = \mathbb{Q}$, $K = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta)$ where $\alpha^2 = -1$ and $\beta^2 = p$ where p is a prime number with $p \equiv 1 \pmod 4$. Then $L_{\alpha,\beta}$ and $L_{\alpha,\alpha\beta}$ are not rational over $\mathbb{Q}$ because $(-1, -p)_{\mathbb{Q}} = (-1, -1)_{\mathbb{Q}} \neq 0$, while $L_{\beta,\alpha}$, $L_{\beta,\alpha\beta}$, $L_{\alpha\beta,\alpha}$ and $L_{\alpha\beta,\beta}$ are rational over $\mathbb{Q}$.

§5. Applications of Theorem 1.14

Lemma 5.1 ([AHK, Theorem 3.1]) *Let L be any field, $L(x)$ be the rational function field of one variable over L, and G be a finite group acting on $L(x)$. Suppose that, for any $\sigma \in G$, $\sigma(L) \subset L$ and $\sigma(x) = a_\sigma x + b_\sigma$ where $a_\sigma, b_\sigma \in L$ and $a_\sigma \neq 0$. Then $L(x)^G = L^G(f)$ for some polynomial $f \in L[x]^G$. In fact, if $m = \min\{\deg g(x) : g(x) \in L[x]^G \backslash L\}$, any polynomial $f \in L[x]^G$ with $\deg f = m$ satisfies the property $L(x)^G = L^G(f)$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.16.

Consider first the case $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$ where $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M_1 = 3$ and $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M_2 = 1$.

Write $M_1 = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \mathbb{Z} \cdot x_i$, $M_2 = \mathbb{Z} \cdot y$, and $k(M) = k(x_1, x_2, x_3, y)$.

Since G acts on $k(M)$ by purely monomial k-automorphisms, it follows that $\sigma(y) = y$ or $\frac{1}{y}$ for any $\sigma \in G$. Define $z = \frac{y-1}{y+1}$ (if $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$), and $z = \frac{1}{y+1}$ (if $\operatorname{char} k = 2$). It follows that $\sigma(z) = z$ or $-z$ (if $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$), and $\sigma(z) = z$ or $z + 1$ (if $\operatorname{char} k = 2$). Apply Lemma 5.1. We find that $k(M)^G = k(x_1, x_2, x_3)^G(f)$ for some polynomial $f \in k(x_1, x_2, x_3)[z]^G$.

Since G acts on $k(x_1, x_2, x_3)^G$ by purely monomial k-automorphisms, the fixed field $k(x_1, x_2, x_3)^G$ is k-rational by Theorem 1.7. Hence the result.

From now on we will concentrate on the case $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$ with $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M_1 = \operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M_2 = 2$.

Step 1. Write $M_1 = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq 2} \mathbb{Z} \cdot x_i$, $M_2 = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq 2} \mathbb{Z} \cdot y_i$, and $k(M) = k(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2)$.

We will apply Theorem 1.14 to show that, for most situations, $k(M)$ is k-rational. In fact, regarding $k(x_1, x_2)$ as the field K, we will use Theorem 1.14 to see whether $K(y_1, y_2)^G$ is k-rational. Alternatively, we may regard $k(y_1, y_2)$ as the field K' and try to study $K'(x_1, x_2)^G$.

In both situations, G acts on $K(y_1, y_2)$ and $K'(x_1, x_2)$ by purely quasi-monomial k-automorphisms. Apply Theorem 1.14. If we are lucky, then either $K(y_1, y_2)^G$ is rational over $K^G = k(x_1, x_2)^G$ or $K'(x_1, x_2)^G$ is rational over $K'^G = k(y_1, y_2)^G$. Since $k(x_1, x_2)^G$ and $k(y_1, y_2)^G$ are k-rational by Theorem 1.6, it follows that either $K(y_1, y_2)^G$ or $K'(x_1, x_2)^G$ is k-rational.

In summary, $k(M)^G$ is k-rational except that both $K(y_1, y_2)^G$ and $K'(x_1, x_2)^G$ fall into the exceptional situation of Theorem 1.14.

Step 2. Suppose that $K(y_1, y_2)^G$ and $K'(x_1, x_2)^G$ fall into the exceptional situation of Theorem 1.14. In particular, $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume M is a faithful G-lattice, i.e. the subgroup $\{\sigma \in G : \sigma(x_i) = x_i,\ \sigma(y_i) = y_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq 2\} = \{1\}$.

Define $N_1 = \{\sigma \in G : \sigma(x_i) = x_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq 2\}$, $N_2 = \{\sigma \in G : \sigma(y_i) = y_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq 2\}$. Note that $N_1 \lhd G$, $N_2 \lhd G$, and $N_1 \cap N_2 = \{1\}$.

In the field $K(y_1, y_2)$, N_2 is the subgroup N of Theorem 1.14 while N_1 is the subgroup H of Theorem 1.14. The reader may interpret N_1 and N_2 for the field $K'(x_1, x_2)$ himself.

Since $K(y_1,y_2)^G$ and $K'(x_1,x_2)^G$ fall into the exceptional situation, we get (i) $(G/N_2, N_1N_2/N_2) \simeq (C_4, C_2)$ or (D_4, C_2), and (ii) $(G/N_1, N_1N_2/N_1) \simeq (C_4, C_2)$ or (D_4, C_2).

Note that $N_1 \simeq N_1N_2/N_2$ and $N_2 \simeq N_1N_2/N_1$. Hence $N_1 \simeq N_2 \simeq C_2$. It follows that either $G/N_1 \simeq C_4 \simeq G/N_2$ or $G/N_1 \simeq D_4 \simeq G/N_2$; the possibility that $(G/N_1, G/N_2) \simeq (C_4, D_4)$ or (D_4, C_4) is ruled out because $|G/N_1| = |G/N_2|$.

Step 3. We consider the cases $(G/N_1, G/N_2) \simeq (C_4, C_4)$ and (D_4, D_4) separately.

Case 1. $G/N_1 \simeq C_4$ and $G/N_2 \simeq C_4$.

Write $N_1 = \langle \tau_1 \rangle$, $N_2 = \langle \tau_2 \rangle$.

Note that τ_2 and G/N_1 act faithfully on M_1. By Theorem 3.1, $G/N_1 = \langle \sigma_1 \rangle \simeq C_4$ and we may choose the generators x_1, x_2 of $k(M_1)$ satisfying $\sigma_1 : x_1 \mapsto x_2$, $x_2 \mapsto \frac{1}{x_1}$, $\tau_2 = \sigma_1^2 : x_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{x_1}$, $x_2 \mapsto \frac{1}{x_2}$ (also see Case 3 in the proof of Theorem 1.14).

Since τ_2 acts trivially on $k(M_2)$, we find that $k(M)^{\langle \tau_2 \rangle} = k(x_1,x_2)^{\langle \tau_2 \rangle}(y_1,y_2) = k(s,t)(y_1,y_2)$ where s, t are defined as

$$s = \frac{x_1x_2+1}{x_1+x_2}, \quad t = \frac{x_1x_2-1}{x_1-x_2} \tag{5.1}$$

by Lemma 3.3. Moreover, $\sigma_1(s) = \frac{1}{s}$, $\sigma_1(t) = -\frac{1}{t}$ (see Case 3 in the proof of Theorem 1.14).

On the other hand, $G/\langle \tau_2 \rangle \simeq G/N_2 \simeq C_4$ acts faithfully on $k(M_2)$. We may choose the generators y_1, y_2 and $G/N_2 = \langle \sigma_2 \rangle$ such that $\sigma_2 : y_1 \mapsto y_2 \mapsto \frac{1}{y_1}$ by Theorem 3.1 again.

Now $k(M)^G = \{k(x_1,x_2)(y_1,y_2)^{N_2}\}^{G/N_2} = k(s,t)(y_1,y_2)^{\langle \sigma_2 \rangle}$.

The action of σ_2 on $k(s,t)$ is induced by the action of G on $k(s,t)$. But the action of G on $k(s,t)$ is just that of σ_1. Hence $\sigma_2(s) = \frac{1}{s}$ and $\sigma_2(t) = -\frac{1}{t}$.

Define $u = \frac{s+1}{s-1}$. Then $\sigma_2(u) = -u$. Hence $k(s,t)(y_1,y_2)^{\langle \sigma_2 \rangle} = k(y_1,y_2,t)(u)^{\langle \sigma_2 \rangle} = k(y_1,y_2,t)^{\langle \sigma_2 \rangle}(f)$ for some polynomial f by Lemma 5.1.

Note that $\sigma_2^2(t) = t$ and $\sigma_2^2(y_i) = \frac{1}{y_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Define $z_1 = \frac{y_1y_2+1}{y_1+y_2}$, $z_2 = \frac{y_1y_2-1}{y_1-y_2}$. By Lemma 3.3 $k(y_1,y_2,t)^{\langle \sigma_2^2 \rangle} = k(z_1,z_2,t)$ and $\sigma_2(z_1) = \frac{1}{z_1}$, $\sigma_2(z_2) = \frac{-1}{z_2}$.

Regard $k(z_1,z_2,t)^{\langle \sigma_2 \rangle} = k(z_2,t)(z_1)^{\langle \sigma_2 \rangle}$ as the function field of a 1-dimensional algebraic torus over the field $k(z_2,t)^{\langle \sigma_2 \rangle}$. We find that $k(z_1,z_2,t)^{\langle \sigma_2 \rangle}$ is rational over $k(z_2,t)^{\langle \sigma_2 \rangle}$ (see Example 1.2). On the other hand, the field $k(z_2,t)^{\langle \sigma_2 \rangle}$ is k-rational by Theorem 1.6. Hence the result.

Case 2. $G/N_1 \simeq D_4$ and $G/N_2 \simeq D_4$.

The proof is almost the same as Case 1.

Write $N_1 = \langle \tau_1 \rangle$, $N_2 = \langle \tau_2 \rangle$, $G/N_1 = \langle \sigma_1, \lambda_1 \rangle \simeq D_4$, $G/N_2 = \langle \sigma_2, \lambda_2 \rangle \simeq D_4$.

As before, apply Theorem 3.1. We may assume that $\tau_2 = \sigma_1^2$ and

$$\sigma_1 : x_1 \mapsto x_2 \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x_1}; \quad \lambda_1 : x_1 \leftrightarrow x_2;$$
$$\sigma_2 : y_1 \mapsto y_2 \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y_1}; \quad \lambda_2 : y_1 \leftrightarrow y_2.$$

It follows that $k(x_1,x_2)^{\langle\tau_2\rangle}=k(s,t)$ where s and t are defined by (5.1). Moreover, as in Subcase 7.1 in the proof of Theorem 1.14, we have

$$\sigma_1 : s\mapsto \tfrac{1}{s},\ t\mapsto -\tfrac{1}{t};\quad \lambda_1 : s\mapsto s,\ t\mapsto -t.$$

Note that $k(M)^G=\{k(x_1,x_2)(y_1,y_2)^{N_2}\}^{G/N_2}=k(s,t)(y_1,y_2)^{G/N_2}$. The action of G/N_2 on $k(s,t)$ is the action induced by $G/N_1=\langle\sigma_1,\lambda_1\rangle$ on $k(s,t)$. In particular, it is a purely monomial action on $k(s)$.

Define $u=\frac{s+1}{s-1}$. The rationality problem of $k(s,t)(y_1,y_2)^{G/N_2}$ is reduced to that of $k(y_1,y_2,t)^{G/N_2}$ by Lemma 5.1. The proof that $k(y_1,y_2,t)^{G/N_2}$ is k-rational is almost the same as that of the last stage of Case 1. The details of the proof is omitted. □

Proposition 5.2 *Let G be a finite group, M a G-lattice. Assume that $M=M_1\oplus M_2\oplus M_3$ as $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-modules where* $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M_1=\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M_2=2$ *and* $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M_3=1$. *For any field k, suppose that G acts on $k(M)$ by purely monomial k-automorphisms. Then $k(M)^G$ is k-rational.*

Proof. Write $M_3=\mathbb{Z}\cdot z$. Then $k(M)=k(M_1\oplus M_2)(z)$ and $\sigma(z)=z$ or $\frac{1}{z}$ for any $\sigma\in G$. Define $u=\frac{z+1}{z-1}$ (if $\operatorname{char} k\neq 2$), and $u=\frac{1}{z+1}$ (if $\operatorname{char} k=2$). It follows that $\sigma(u)=\pm u$ (if $\operatorname{char} k\neq 2$), and $\sigma(u)=u$ or $u+1$ (if $\operatorname{char} k=2$).

Apply Lemma 5.1. We find $k(M)^G=k(M_1\oplus M_2)^G(f)$ for some polynomial f. Since $k(M_1\oplus M_2)^G$ is k-rational by Theorem 1.16, it follows that $k(M)^G$ is k-rational. □

§6. Some decomposable lattices of rank 5

Before extending the method in the proof of Theorem 1.16, we recall the definition of retract rationality.

Definition 6.1 ([Sa1; Ka5]) Let k be an infinite field and L/k be a field extension. L is called retract k-rational if L is the quotient field of some integral domain A where $k\subset A\subset L$ satisfying the conditions that there exist a polynomial ring $k[X_1,\ldots,X_m]$, some non-zero polynomial $f\in k[X_1,\ldots,X_n]$, and k-algebra morphisms $\varphi : A\to k[X_1,\ldots,X_m][1/f]$, $\psi : k[X_1,\ldots,X_m][1/f]\to A$ such that $\psi\circ\varphi=1_A$.

It is not difficult to see that "k-rational"⇒"stably k-rational"⇒"retract k-rational" ⇒"k-unirational".

Theorem 6.2 *Let G be a finite group, M be a G-lattice. Assume that* (i) $M=M_1\oplus M_2$ *as $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-modules where* $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M_1=3$ *and* $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M_2=2$, (ii) *either M_1 or M_2 is a faithful G-lattice. Let k be a field and G act on $k(M)$ by purely monomial k-automorphisms. Then $k(M)^G$ is k-rational except the following situation :* $\operatorname{char} k\neq 2$, $G=\langle\sigma,\tau\rangle\simeq D_4$ and $M_1=\bigoplus_{1\le i\le 3}\mathbb{Z}x_i$, $M_2=\bigoplus_{1\le j\le 2}\mathbb{Z}y_j$ such that $\sigma : x_1\leftrightarrow x_2$,

$x_3 \mapsto -x_1-x_2-x_3$, $y_1 \mapsto y_2 \mapsto -y_1$, $\tau : x_1 \leftrightarrow x_3$, $x_2 \mapsto -x_1-x_2-x_3$, $y_1 \leftrightarrow y_2$ where the $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-module structure of M is written additively.

For the exceptional case, $k(M)^G$ is not retract k-rational. In particular, it is not k-rational.

Proof. Consider first the case M_1 is a faithful G-lattice. It follows that $k(M)^G = k(M_1)(M_2)^G$ is isomorphic to the function field of some 2-dimensional algebraic torus defined over $k(M_1)^G$ and split over $k(M_1)$ (see Example 1.2). By Theorem 1.3, $k(M)^G$ is rational over $k(M_1)^G$. On the other hand, $k(M_1)^G$ is rational over k by Theorem 1.7. Hence $k(M)^G$ is k-rational.

For the rest of the proof we consider the case when M_2 is a faithful G-lattice.

Step 1. Write $M_1 = \bigoplus_{1\le i\le 3} \mathbb{Z}x_i$, $M_2 = \bigoplus_{1\le j\le 2} \mathbb{Z}y_j$. Define $H = \{\sigma \in G : \sigma(x_i) = x_i \text{ for } 1 \le i \le 3\}$.

There are three possibilities : $H = \{1\}$, G or a non-trivial proper normal subgroup of G.

If $H = \{1\}$, then M_1 is also a faithful G-lattice. Hence $k(M)^G$ is k-rational by the first paragraph of this proof.

If $H = G$, then $k(M)^G = k(y_1,y_2)(x_1,x_2,x_3)^G = k(y_1,y_2)^G(x_1,x_2,x_3)$. Since $k(y_1,y_2)^G$ is k-rational by Theorem 1.6, it follows that $k(M)^G$ is k-rational.

If H is a non-trivial proper normal subgroup of G, we apply Theorem 1.14 to $k(M) = k(M_1)(M_2) = K(y_1,y_2)$ with $K = k(M_1)$. It follows that $k(M)^G$ is rational over $k(M_1)^G$ except when $\operatorname{char} k \ne 2$ and $(G,H) \simeq (C_4,C_2)$ or (D_4,C_2). Since $k(M_1)^G$ is k-rational by Theorem 1.7, it follows that $k(M)^G$ is k-rational except for the above situation.

Step 2. Consider the exceptional situation in Theorem 1.14, i.e. $\operatorname{char} k \ne 2$ and $(G,H) \simeq (C_4,C_2)$, (D_4,C_2).

We consider the case $(G,H) \simeq (C_4,C_2)$ first. The case $(G,H) \simeq (D_4,C_2)$ will be treated later.

Write $G = \langle\sigma\rangle \simeq C_4$ and $H = \langle\sigma^2\rangle$.

Note that $k(M)^G = k(M_2)(M_1)^G = \{k(M_2)(M_1)^H\}^{G/H} = \{k(M_2)^H(M_1)\}^{G/H}$. Since G/H acts faithfully on $k(M_2)^H$, we may regard $\{k(M_2)^H(M_1)\}^{G/H}$ as the function field of a 3-dimensional algebraic torus defined over $k(M_2)^H$.

We try to apply Theorem 1.4 to assert that $\{k(M_2)^H(M_1)\}^{G/H}$ is rational over $\{k(M_2)^H\}^{G/H}$. For this purpose, we should study Kunyavskii's list [Ku, Theorem 1] closely. Since $G/H \simeq C_2$, every algebraic torus split over a C_2-extension is rational by [Ku, Theorem 1] (this fact may also be observed by the integral extension of C_2). Hence $\{k(M_2)^H(M_1)\}^{G/H}$ is rational over $\{k(M_2)^H\}^{G/H} \simeq k(M_2)^G$. Since $k(M_2)^G$ is k-rational by Theorem 1.6, it follows that $k(M)^G$ is k-rational.

Step 3. Now consider the case $\operatorname{char} k \ne 2$ and $(G,H) \simeq (D_4,C_2)$.

From Subcase 7.1 in the proof of Theorem 1.14 in Section 4, it is not difficult to see that $G = \langle\sigma,\tau\rangle \simeq D_4$ with $\sigma : y_1 \mapsto y_2 \mapsto \frac{1}{y_1}$, $\tau : y_1 \leftrightarrow y_2$. Note that $H = \langle\sigma^2\rangle$ and $G/H \simeq C_2 \times C_2$ acts faithfully on M_1.

Note that $k(M)^G = k(M_2)(M_1)^G$. We may regard $k(M_2)(M_1)^G$ as the function field of an algebraic torus defined over $k(M_2)^G$.

We check Kunyavskii's list [Ku, Theorem 1] again. Such an algebraic torus is rational over $k(M_2)^G$ (and therefore $k(M)^G$ is k-rational), except when M_1 is the lattice U_1(see [Ku, page 2]). The lattice U_1 is a faithful lattice over $\mathbb{Z}[G/H]$ with $G/H \simeq C_2 \times C_2$.

The lattice U_1 or the associated finite subgroup in $GL_3(\mathbb{Z})$ is conjugate to the group $G_{3,1,4}$ in [BBNWZ]. Hence the action of $G/H = \langle \sigma, \tau \rangle$ on x_1, x_2, x_3 may be given as $\sigma : x_1 \leftrightarrow x_2,\ x_3 \mapsto \frac{1}{x_1x_2x_3},\ \tau : x_1 \leftrightarrow x_3,\ x_2 \mapsto \frac{1}{x_1x_2x_3}$.

We conclude that $k(M)^G = k(M_2)(M_1)^G$ is k-rational except when $G/H = \langle \sigma, \tau \rangle$ acts on M_1 as $\sigma : x_1 \leftrightarrow x_2,\ x_3 \mapsto -x_1 - x_2 - x_3,\ \tau : x_1 \leftrightarrow x_3,\ x_2 \mapsto -x_1 - x_2 - x_3$.

It follows that M_1 is a G-lattice where $G = \langle \sigma_0, \tau \rangle \simeq D_4$ and σ_0^2 acting trivially on M_1 (note that σ is the image of σ_0 in G/H).

Re-write the generators of G. We conclude that the only unsettled situation is the following: $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$, $G = \langle \sigma, \tau \rangle \simeq D_4$, $\sigma : x_1 \leftrightarrow x_2,\ x_3 \mapsto -x_1 - x_2 - x_3,\ y_1 \mapsto y_2 \mapsto -y_1,\ \tau : x_1 \leftrightarrow x_3,\ x_2 \mapsto -x_1 - x_2 - x_3,\ y_1 \leftrightarrow y_2$.

For this situation, we will show that $k(x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2)^G$ is not k-rational; in fact, it is not even retract k-rational.

Note that $k(x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2)^G = (k(y_1, y_2)^{\langle \sigma^2 \rangle}(x_1, x_2, x_3))^{G/\langle \sigma^2 \rangle}$. The 3-dimensional algebraic torus with function field $(k(y_1, y_2)^{\langle \sigma^2 \rangle}(x_1, x_2, x_3))^{G/\langle \sigma^2 \rangle}$ is not rational over $(k(y_1, y_2)^{\langle \sigma^2 \rangle})^{G/\langle \sigma^2 \rangle} = k(y_1, y_2)^G$ by Kunyavskii's Theorem [Ku, Theorem 1]. But this doesn't entail that $k(x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2)^G$ is or is not rational over k. The proof of the non-rationality of $k(x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2)^G$ over k will be given in the following Theorem 6.4. $\square$

Theorem 6.3 *Let k be an infinite field with* $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$, *and $G = \langle \tau \rangle \simeq C_2$ act on the rational function field $k(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$ by k-automorphisms defined as*

$$\tau : x_1 \mapsto -x_1,\ \ x_2 \mapsto \tfrac{x_4}{x_2},\ \ x_3 \mapsto \tfrac{-(x_4-1)x_1^2 + x_4(x_4-1)}{x_3},\ \ x_4 \mapsto x_4.$$

Then $k(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)^{\langle \tau \rangle}$ is not retract k-rational.

Proof. Suppose that $k(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)^{\langle \tau \rangle}$ is retract k-rational and $\bar{k}$ is an algebraic closure of k. Choose the k-algebra A and morphisms φ, ψ provided in Definition 6.1. We get $\psi \circ \varphi = 1$ where

$$A \xrightarrow{\varphi} k[X_1, \ldots, X_m][1/f] \xrightarrow{\psi} A.$$

Tensor the above morphisms with $\bar{k}$. We get $A \otimes_k \bar{k} \to \bar{k}[X_1, \ldots, X_m][1/f] \to A \otimes_k \bar{k}$ and the composite map is $1_{A \otimes_k \bar{k}}$. In other words, $A \otimes_k \bar{k}$ is also retract $\bar{k}$-rational.

Thus, to prove Theorem 6.3, we may assume that the field k is algebraically closed.

Step 1. Let k be an algebraically closed field with $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$, and $H = \langle \sigma, \lambda \rangle \simeq C_2 \times C_2$ act on the rational function field $k(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4)$ by k-automorphisms defined as

$$\begin{aligned}&\sigma : v_1 \mapsto v_2 v_4,\ v_2 \mapsto v_1 v_4,\ v_3 \mapsto \tfrac{1}{v_3},\ v_4 \mapsto \tfrac{1}{v_4},\\ &\lambda : v_1 \mapsto \tfrac{1}{v_1 v_4},\ v_2 \mapsto \tfrac{1}{v_2 v_4},\ v_3 \mapsto -v_3,\ v_4 \mapsto v_4.\end{aligned}$$

By [CHKK, Example 5.11, page 2355], the fixed field $k(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4)^H$ is not retract k-rational. We will show that $k(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4)^H$ is k-isomorphic to $k(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)^{\langle\tau\rangle}$ and finish the proof.

Step 2. Define

$$u_1 = v_1, \quad u_2 = v_2 v_4, \quad u_3 = \frac{v_3+1}{v_3-1}, \quad u_4 = \frac{v_4+1}{v_4-1}.$$

Then $k(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) = k(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}&\sigma : u_1 \mapsto u_2,\ u_2 \mapsto u_1,\ u_3 \mapsto -u_3,\ u_4 \mapsto -u_4,\\ &\lambda : u_1 \mapsto \tfrac{u_4-1}{u_1(u_4+1)},\ u_2 \mapsto \tfrac{u_4+1}{u_2(u_4-1)},\ u_3 \mapsto \tfrac{1}{u_3},\ u_4 \mapsto u_4.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $k(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4)^{\langle\sigma\rangle} = k(w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)$ where

$$w_1 = \frac{u_1+u_2}{2}, \quad w_2 = \frac{u_1-u_2}{2u_4}, \quad w_3 = \frac{u_3}{u_4}, \quad w_4 = u_4^2.$$

The action of λ on $k(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4)^{\langle\sigma\rangle} = k(w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)$ is

$$\lambda : w_1 \mapsto \tfrac{w_1+w_1w_4+2w_2w_4}{(w_4-1)(w_1^2-w_2^2w_4)},\ w_2 \mapsto -\tfrac{2w_1+w_2+w_2w_4}{(w_4-1)(w_1^2-w_2^2w_4)},\ w_3 \mapsto \tfrac{1}{w_3w_4},\ w_4 \mapsto w_4.$$

Step 3. Define

$$\begin{aligned}x_1 &= \frac{w_1+w_2w_4}{w_1+w_2}, \quad x_2 = \frac{w_2(w_4-1)(w_1^2-w_2^2w_4)}{(w_1+w_2)(2w_1+w_2+w_2w_4)},\\ x_3 &= \frac{w_2w_3w_4(2w_1+w_2+w_2w_4)}{(w_1+w_2)^2}, \quad x_4 = \frac{w_1^2-w_2^2w_4}{(w_1+w_2)^2}\end{aligned}$$

then $K(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = K(w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)$ because

$$w_1 = \frac{x_2(x_1+x_4)}{x_4(x_1-1)}, \quad w_2 = -\frac{x_2(x_4-1)}{x_4(x_1-1)}, \quad w_3 = \frac{x_3}{x_1^2-x_4}, \quad w_4 = -\frac{x_1^2-x_4}{x_4-1}.$$

The action of λ on $K(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$ is given by

$$\lambda : x_1 \mapsto -x_1,\ x_2 \mapsto \tfrac{x_4}{x_2},\ x_3 \mapsto \tfrac{-(x_4-1)x_1^2+x_4(x_4-1)}{x_3},\ x_4 \mapsto x_4.$$

This is just the action given in the statement of this theorem. $\square$

Theorem 6.4 *Let k be an infinite field with $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$, and $G = \langle \rho, \tau \rangle \simeq D_4$ act on the rational function field $k(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5)$ by k-automorphisms defined as*

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &: x_1 \mapsto x_2,\ x_2 \mapsto x_1,\ x_3 \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x_1x_2x_3},\ x_4 \mapsto x_5,\ x_5 \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x_4},\\ \tau &: x_1 \mapsto x_3,\ x_2 \mapsto \tfrac{1}{x_1x_2x_3},\ x_3 \mapsto x_1,\ x_4 \mapsto x_5,\ x_5 \mapsto x_4.\end{aligned}$$

Then $k(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5)^G$ is not retract k-rational. In particular, it is not k-rational.

Proof. Step 1. By Lemma 3.3 we find $k(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5)^{\langle \rho^2 \rangle} = k(X_1, \ldots, X_5)$ where

$$X_1 = x_1, \quad X_2 = x_2, \quad X_3 = x_3, \quad X_4 := \frac{x_4x_5 + 1}{x_4 + x_5}, \quad X_5 := \frac{x_4x_5 - 1}{x_4 - x_5}.$$

The actions of ρ and τ on $K(X_1, \ldots, X_5)$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &: X_1 \mapsto X_2,\ X_2 \mapsto X_1,\ X_3 \mapsto \tfrac{1}{X_1X_2X_3},\ X_4 \mapsto \tfrac{1}{X_4},\ X_5 \mapsto -\tfrac{1}{X_5},\\ \tau &: X_1 \mapsto X_3,\ X_2 \mapsto \tfrac{1}{X_1X_2X_3},\ X_3 \mapsto X_1,\ X_4 \mapsto X_4,\ X_5 \mapsto -X_5.\end{aligned}$$

Step 2. We recall a result of invariant generators [HKY, Lemma 3.9]: Let k be a field with $\operatorname{char} k \neq 2$, $c \in k \backslash \{0\}$, and τ act on $k(x, y, z)$ by

$$\tau : x \leftrightarrow y,\ z \mapsto \tfrac{c}{xyz}.$$

Then $k(x, y, z)^{\langle \tau \rangle} = k(t_1, t_2, t_3)$ where

$$t_1 = \frac{xy}{x+y}, \quad t_2 = \frac{xyz + \frac{c}{z}}{x+y}, \quad t_3 = \frac{xyz - \frac{c}{z}}{x-y}.$$

Step 3. By the formula in Step 2, we find that $k(X_1, \ldots, X_5)^{\langle \tau \rangle} = k(y_1, \ldots, y_5)$ where

$$y_1 = \frac{2X_1X_3}{X_1 + X_3},\ y_2 = \frac{X_1X_2X_3 + \frac{1}{X_2}}{X_1 + X_3},\ y_3 = \frac{X_1X_2X_3 - \frac{1}{X_2}}{X_1 - X_3},\ y_4 = X_4,\ y_5 = \frac{2X_5}{X_1 - X_3}.$$

The action of ρ on $k(y_1, \ldots, y_5)$ is given by

$$\rho : y_1 \mapsto -\tfrac{(y_2+y_3)(y_2-y_3)}{y_1y_2(y_3+1)(y_3-1)},\ y_2 \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y_2},\ y_3 \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y_3},\ y_4 \mapsto \tfrac{1}{y_4},\ y_5 \mapsto \tfrac{(y_2+y_3)(y_2-y_3)}{y_3y_5(y_2+1)(y_2-1)}.$$

Step 4. Define

$$\begin{gathered} z_1 = \frac{y_3+1}{y_3-1}, \quad z_2 = \frac{\sqrt{-1}y_5(y_2-1)}{y_1y_2(y_3-1)},\\ z_3 = \frac{2\sqrt{-1}y_1y_2(y_3+1)}{(y_2+1)(y_3-1)}, \quad z_4 = \frac{(y_2-1)(y_3+1)}{(y_2+1)(y_3-1)}, \quad z_5 = \frac{(y_2-1)(y_4+1)}{(y_2+1)(y_4-1)},\end{gathered}$$

then the action of ρ on $k(y_1,\ldots,y_5)=k(z_1,\ldots,z_5)$ is given by

$$\rho : z_1 \mapsto -z_1,\ z_2 \mapsto \tfrac{z_4}{z_2},\ z_3 \mapsto \tfrac{-(z_4-1)z_1^2+z_4(z_4-1)}{z_3},\ z_4 \mapsto z_4,\ z_5 \mapsto z_5.$$

By Theorem 6.3, $k(z_1,z_2,z_3,z_4)^{\langle\rho\rangle}$ is not retract k-rational. Since $k(z_1,z_2,z_3,z_4,z_5)^{\langle\rho\rangle} = k(z_1,z_2,z_3,z_4)^{\langle\rho\rangle}(z_5)$ and the retract rationality is stable under rational extensions [Sa1, Proposition 3.6; Ka5, Lemma 3.4], it follows that $k(z_1,z_2,z_3,z_4,z_5)^{\langle\rho\rangle}$ is not retract k-rational. $\square$

Remark. In Theorem 6.3, by applying Yamasaki's result [Ya, Lemma 4.3], we can show that $k(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4)^{\langle\tau\rangle}$ is not retract rational over $k(x_4)$. But it is not clear that we can show that $k(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4)^{\langle\tau\rangle}$ is not retract k-rational by this approach.

On the other hand, define

$$t_1=x_1,\ t_2=-\frac{x_2(x_1^2-1)}{x_4-1},\ t_3=\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x_3}{x_4-1}-\frac{x_1^2-x_4}{x_3}\right),\ t_4=\frac{1}{2x_1}\left(\frac{x_3}{x_4-1}+\frac{x_1^2-x_4}{x_3}\right).$$

Then τ acts on $K(t_1,t_2,t_3,t_4)=K(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4)$ by

$$\tau : t_1 \mapsto -t_1,\ t_2 \mapsto \tfrac{(t_1^2t_4^2-t_3^2+1)(t_1^2(t_4^2+1)-t_3^2)}{t_2},\ t_3 \mapsto t_3,\ t_4 \mapsto t_4.$$

Define $t=t_1^2$. Then $k(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4)^{\langle\tau\rangle}=k(u,v,t,t_3,t_4)$ with the relation

$$u^2-tv^2=(tt_4^2-t_3^2+1)(t+tt_4^2-t_3^2).$$

Theorem 6.5 *Let G be a finite group, $G\simeq Gal(K/k)$, M be a decomposable G-lattice, i.e. $M=M_1\oplus M_2$ as $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-modules where $1\le \operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M_1 < \operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M$.*

(1) If k is an infinite field, then $K(M)^G$ is retract k-rational if and only if so are $K(M_1)^G$ and $K(M_2)^G$.

(2) If $K(M_1)^G$ and $K(M_2)^G$ are k-rational, so is $K(M)^G$.

(3) If $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M_i \le 3$ for $i=1,2$, then $K(M)^G$ is k-rational if and only if so are $K(M_1)^G$ and $K(M_2)^G$.

Proof. Step 1.

First we show that, if M decomposes as above, then $K(M)^G$ is k-isomorphic to the free composite of $K(M_1)^G$ and $K(M_2)^G$ over k.

Let T,T_1,T_2 be the algebraic tori over K whose character modules are M,M_1,M_2 respectively. Note that the function fields of T,T_1,T_2 are $K(M)^G,K(M_1)^G,K(M_2)^G$. Since the category of character modules is anti-equivalent to the category of algebraic tori [Vo2, page 27, Example 6; KMRT, page 333, Proposition 20.17], we find that T is isomorphic to $T_1\times T_2$. Hence the result.

Alternatively, this result can be proved by showing $[K(M):L]\le|G|$ where L is the free composite of $K(M_1)^G$ and $K(M_2)^G$. The details are omitted.

Step 2.

Consider $K(M_1)^G \subset K(M)^G = K(M_1)(M_2)^G$. By [Sa2, Theorem 1.3; Ka5, Lemma 3.4 (iv)], $K(M_1)^G$ is a dense retraction of $K(M)^G$. If $K(M)^G$ is retract k-rational, by [Sa2, Lemma 1.1; Ka5, Lemma 3.4 (iii)], then $K(M_1)^G$ is also retract k-rational. Similarly for $K(M_2)^G$.

Now assume that both $K(M_1)^G$ and $K(M_2)^G$ are retract k-rational. Consider $k \subset K(M_1)^G \subset K(M)^G$. Since $K(M_2)^G$ is retract k-rational, choose the affine domain A whose quotient field is $K(M_2)^G$, the localized polynomial ring, the k-algebraic morphisms, etc. provided in Definition 6.1. Tensor all these with $K(M_1)^G$. We find that the free composite of $K(M_1)^G$ and $K(M_2)^G$ is retract rational over $K(M_1)^G$. By Step 1, the free composite of $K(M_1)^G$ and $K(M_2)^G$ is nothing but $K(M)^G$. We conclude that $K(M)^G$ is retract rational over $K(M_1)^G$ and $K(M_1)^G$ is retract rational over k. By [Ka5, Theorem 4.2], $K(M)^G$ is retract k-rational.

Alternatively, we may use Saltman's Theorem that $K(M)^G$ is retract k-rational if and only if $[M]^{fl}$ is an invertible G-lattice where $[M]^{fl}$ is the flabby class of M (see [Sa2, Theorem 1.3] and [Ka5, Section 2]). Note that$[M_1 \oplus M_2]^{fl} = [M_1]^{fl} \oplus [M_2]^{fl}$. The details are omitted.

Step 3.

If $K(M_1)^G$ and $K(M_2)^G$ are k-rational, $K(M)^G$ is also k-rational by Step 1.

Step 4.

We will prove that, if $K(M)^G$ is k-rational, then both $K(M_1)^G$ and $K(M_2)^G$ are k-rational.

If $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M_i \leq 2$, this follows from Theorem 1.3.

From now on, we assume that $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M_1 = 3$. Since $K(M)^G$ is retract k-rational, we find that $K(M_1)^G$ is also retract k-rational by Step 2.

In [Ku, Theorem 1], Kunyavskii not only finds a birational classification of 3-dimensional algebraic tori, but also proves that, if an algebraic torus is not k-rational, it is nor retract k-rational (see Theorem 1.4 and [Ka5, page 25, the fifth paragraph]). Hence $K(M_1)^G$ is k-rational. □

References

[AHK] H. Ahmad, M. Hajja and M. Kang, *Rationality of some projective linear actions*, J. Algebra 228 (2000), 643–658.

[BBNWZ] H. Brown, R. Büllow, J. Neubüser, H. Wondratschek and H. Zassenhaus, *Crystallographic groups of four-dimensional spaces*, John Wiley, New York, 1978.

[CHKK] H. Chu, S.-J. Hu, M. Kang and B. E. Kunyavskii, *Noether's problem and the unramified Brauer group for groups of order 64*, International Math. Research Notices 12 (2010), 2329–2366.

[CTS] J.-L. Colliot-Thélène and J.-J. Sansuc, *The rationality problem for fields of invariants under linear algebraic groups* (with special regards to the Brauer groups), in "Proc. International Conference, Mumbai, 2004" edited by V. Mehta, Narosa Publishing House, 2007.

[Dr] P. K. Draxl, *Skew fields*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series vol. 81, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1983.

[GAP] The GAP Groups, GAP-Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, Version 4.4.10; 2007. (http://www.gap-system.org)

[Ha] M. Hajja, *Rationality of finite groups of monomial automorphisms of $K(x,y)$*, J. Algebra 109 (1987), 46–51.

[HHR] K. Hashimoto, A. Hoshi and Y. Rikuna, *Noether's problem and $\mathbb{Q}$-generic polynomials for the normalizer of the 8-cycle in S_8 and its subgroups*, Math. Comp. 77 (2008), 1153–1183.

[HK1] M. Hajja and M. Kang, *Finite group actions on rational function fields*, J. Algebra 149 (1992), 139–154.

[HK2] M. Hajja and M. Kang, *Three-dimensional purely monomial group actions*, J. Algebra 170 (1994), 805–860.

[HKO] M. Hajja, M. Kang and J. Ohm, *Function fields of conics as invariant subfields*, J. Algebra 163 (1994), 383–403.

[HKY] A. Hoshi, H. Kitayama and A. Yamasaki, *Rationality problem of three-dimensional monomial group actions*, J. Algebra 341 (2011), 45–108.

[HR] A. Hoshi and Y. Rikuna, *Rationality problem of three-dimensional purely monomial group actions: the last case*, Math. Comp. 77 (2008), 1823–1829.

[Ka1] M. Kang, *Constructions of Brauer-Severi varieties and norm hypersurfaces*, Canadian J. Math. 42 (1990), 230–238.

[Ka2] M. Kang, *Rationality problem of GL_4 group actions*, Advances in Math. 181 (2004), 321–352.

[Ka3] M. Kang, *Some rationality problems revisited*, in "Proceedings of the 4th ICCM, Hangzhou, 2007", edited by Lizhen Ji, Kefeng Liu, Lo Yang and Shing-Tung Yau, Higher Education Press (Beijing) and International Press (Somerville), 2007.

[Ka4] M. Kang, *Retract rationality and Noether's problem*, International Math. Research Notices 15 (2009), 2760–2788.

[Ka5] M. Kang, *Retract rational fields*, J. Algebra 349 (2012), 22–37.

[Ki] I. Kiming, *Explicit classifications of some* 2*-extensions of a field of characteristic different from* 2, Canadian J. Math. 42 (1990), 825–855.

[KMRT] M.-A. Knus, A. Merkurjev, M. Rost and J.-P. Tignol, *The book of involutions*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1998.

[KMZ] M. Kang, I. Michailov and J. Zhou, *Noether's problem for groups with a cyclic subgroup of index 4*, arXiv: 1108.3379.

[KP] M. Kang and B. Plans, *Reduction theorems for Noether's problem*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 137 (2009), 1867–1874.

[KPr] M. Kang and Y. G. Prokhorov, *Rationality of three-dimensional quotients by monomial actions*, J. Algebra 324 (2010), 2166–2197.

[Ku] B. E. Kunyavskii, *Three-dimensional algebraic tori*, Selecta Math. Soviet. 9 (1990), 1–21.

[La] T. Y. Lam, *The algebraic theory of quadratic forms*, W. A. Benjamin, Inc., Reading, Massachusetts, 1973.

[Le] A. Ledet, *Brauer type embedding problems*, Fields Inst. Monographs vol. 21, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2005.

[MT] Y. I. Manin and M. A. Tsfasman, *Rational varieties: algebra, geometry and arithmetric*, Russian Math. Survey 41 (1986), 51–116.

[Ma] K. Masuda, *On a problem of Chevalley*, Nagoya Math. J. 8 (1955), 59–63.

[Na] M. Nagata, *A theorem on valuation rings and its applications*, Nagoya Math. J. 29 (1967), 85–91.

[Oj] M. Ojanguren, *The Witt group and the problem of Lüroth*, ETS Editrice, Pisa, 1990.

[Pr] Y. G. Prokhorov, *Fields of invariants of finite linear groups*, in "Cohomological and geometric approaches to rationality problems", edited by F. Bogomolov and Y. Tschinkel, Progress in Math. vol. 282, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2010.

[Ro1] P. Roquette, *On the Galois cohomology of the projective linear group and its applications to the construction of generic splitting fields of algebras*, Math. Ann. 150 (1963), 411–439.

[Ro2] P. Roquette, *Isomorphisms of generic splitting fields of simple algebras*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 214/215 (1964), 207–226.

[Sa1] D. J. Saltman, *Retract rational fields and cyclic Galois extensions*, Israel J. Math. 47 (1984), 165–215.

[Sa2] D. J. Saltman, *Multiplicative field invariants*, J. Algebra 106 (1987), 221–238.

[Sa3] D. J. Saltman, *Twisted multiplicative field invariants, Noether's problem and Galois extensions*, J. Algebra 131 (1990), 535–558.

[Sa4] D. J. Saltman, *Multiplicative field invariants and the Brauer group*, J. Algebra 133 (1990), 533–544.

[Se] J-P. Serre, *Local fields*, Springer GTM vol. 67, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1979.

[Sw] R. G. Swan, *Noether's problem in Galois theory*, in "Emmy Noether in Bryn Mawr", edited by B. Srinivasan and J. Sally, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.

[Vo1] V. E. Voskresenskii, *On two-dimensional algebraic tori II* Math. USSR Izv. 1 (1967), 691–696.

[Vo2] V. E. Voskresenskii, *Algebraic groups and their birational invariants*, Transl. Math. Monographs vol. 179, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1998.

[Ya] A. Yamasaki, *Negative solutions to three-dimensional monomial Noether problem*, arXiv:0909.0586.